JPRS-TAC-86-052

2 JULY 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from Engli.h-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-052
2 JULY 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT
ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

Soviet Premier Ryzhkov's 'Star Peace' Message to UN
(Moscow TASS, 12 Jun 86)..... 1

TASS Reports UN Session on Peaceful Use of Space
(Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Jun 86)..... 6

Session Opens 6
'Star Peace' Plan Proposed 7
U.S. 'Reply' Hit 8
Backing for 'Star Peace' 8

TASS Cites Proxmire: U.S. Space Programs Threaten ABM Treaty
(Moscow TASS, 9 Jun 86)..... 9

Moscow TV Notes Foundations Behind SDI Program
(Moscow Television Service, 12 Jun 86)..... 10

PRC Condemns SDI at Nuclear Disarmament Convention
(Beijing XINHUA, 9 Jun 86)..... 12

Briefs
Soviet Academician Receives Envoys 13
TASS Hits AEI-Defense Conference 13
TASS on 'Secret' DOE Conference 13

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR's Zamyatin on Soviet Proposals, 'Spirit of Geneva'
(London ITV Television Network, 6 Jun 86)..... 14

Soviet General on Pact Proposals, SALT, ABM Treaties, SDI
(Nikolay Chervov Interview; East Berlin Domestic Service, 9 Jun 86; Budapest Television Service, 12 Jun 86)..... 16

Chervov Interviewed in East Berlin 16
'Panorama' Interview on SALT II, SDI 18

PRAVDA: GDR's Honecker Backs Gorbachev Arms Curb Proposals
(Moscow PRAVDA, 24 May 86)..... 21

TASS Reports on Geneva Meetings 3-12 June
(Moscow TASS, various dates)..... 22

Space Weapons Group 3 June 22
Strategic Arms Group 4 June 22
Space Arms Group 10 June 22
INF Group 5 June 22
Plenary Meeting 11 June 22
INF Group 12 June 23

Moscow on European Interest Breaking 'Deadlock'
(Moscow in English to North America, 8 Jun 86)..... 24

Moscow Talk Show Views U.S., Soviet Attitudes
(Moscow Domestic Service, 6 Jun 86)..... 27

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: U.S., Allied Reaction to Reagan SALT II Decision
(Various sources, various dates)..... 30

UK Tories Evince 'Alarm, Anxiety' 30
Paris Paper Cited 30
CBS: Reagan 'Under Fire' 31
Warnke: Reagan's 'Blunder' 31
Criticism in U.S., Abroad 32
European Reaction Reviewed 32
World 'Perturbed' 34
'Storm of Indignation' in U.S. Congress 35
FRG's Genscher Urges Compliance 36
'Slap in Face' for Allies 37
'Divide' Between U.S., NATO Partners 38
U.S. Hawks on 'Eurowimps' 39
Canadian Think Tank Refutes U.S. Charges 40
UK Labor Party Official Critical, Denzil Davies Interview 41
U.S. in 'Difficult' Position 43
House Committee Urges Compliance 44

Soviet Reports, Comments on Reagan SALT II Policy
(Various sources, various dates)..... 45

Speakes: Decision 'Final' 45
White House Briefing 45
U.S. Claims Rebutted 46
Effect on Summit Plans, Viktor Afanasayev Interview 47
Arms Race 'Pedal to Floor' 48
News Conference at UN 51
Adelman Statement Scored, by M. Milshteyn 52
Reagan 11 June Press Conference 53
White House Pronounces SALT II 'Dead' 53

USSR's Bovin Views U.S. Rationale for Renouncing SALT II
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 11 Jun 86)..... 54

Reportage on Moscow 4 June Press Conference on SALT II
(Various sources, various dates)..... 58

TV Broadcast 58
Bessmertnykh on U.S. Charges 60
Akhromeyev on Soviet Response 61
Bessmertnykh on Possibility of Summit 62
AFP Report 62
SDI, INF Issues Raised 63
TASS Summary 65

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS Highlights Nuclear Arms in U.S.-Japanese Exercises
(Moscow TASS, 9 Jun 86)..... 67

Moscow: Underground Nuclear Base Being Built in ROK
(Moscow International Service, 5 Jun 86)..... 69

Briefs
FRG Cruise Missile Plans 70

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Moscow: U.S. To Deploy Chemical Weapons in Europe, Asia
(Moscow Radio Peace and Progress, 2 Jun 86)..... 71

USSR: 'Recklessness, Adventurism' of U.S. CW Program Hit
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 1 Jun 86)..... 72

IZVESTIYA Assails U.S. CW Plans in Europe, Urges Ban
(O. Molov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 May 86)..... 76

PRAVDA Contrasts Western, USSR Attitudes Toward CW
(Moscow PRAVDA, 3 Jun 86)..... 80

USSR Late May Comments on NATO Vote for Crisis Deployment
(Various sources, various dates)..... 84

Italian Deputies Opposed 84
Danish Parliament Votes No 84
NATO Military Group Discussion 84
Weinberger on European Worries 85
FRG Defense Minister's Statement 86
'Reservations' Stated 87
'Execution of Commands' 87
Pentagon Pressures NATO 88
Commentary on 'Morality' 89
Reasons for U.S. 'Hurry', Vladimir Bogachev Interview 91
Pentagon 'Chemical Trap' 92
Commentary on European Opposition, by Nikolay Gratisnov 93
Congressional Criticism Cited 94
U.S. 'Distorted Logic' 95
'Hypocritical Phrases' on Peace 95
Risks to Civilians Stressed, by Nikolay Borin 97
Pentagon's Plan Said 'Almost Complete' 99
Soviet Proposals Recalled 99

TASS on Belgian Parliament's Vote Against CW Deployment
(Moscow TASS, 5, 11 Jun 86)..... 101

'Clear Warning' to U.S. 101
West European Split 102

USSR: FRG SPD Assails Government on CW Deployment
(Moscow TASS, 22, 28 May 86)..... 104

Issues Statement 104
Kohl 'Deluding Public' 104
Foreign Policy Expert 105

Soviet Envoy to Bonn: CW Treaty 'About To Be Concluded'
(Hamburg DPA, 12 Jun 86)..... 107

Moscow on UK Agreement for Stationing U.S. Binary Arms
(Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 22 May 86)
Moscow TASS, 19 May 86)..... 108

Role in Air-Land Battle 108
Protests Expected, by Nikolay Pakhomov 110

Soviet Press Conference on NATO Binary Arms Plans
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 22 May 86)..... 111

TASS: VOA Uses Yellow Rain Story To Aid U.S. Gas Program
(Moscow TASS, 11 Jun 86)..... 113

Briefs
CW-Free Region 115

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

Soviet Paper Urges Action on European Arms Levels
(Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 5 Jun 86)..... 116

USSR: Comments, Reports on June Opening of CD Summer Session
(Various sources, various dates)..... 119

Commentary on Need for Disarmament 119
Soviet, Mexican Delegates Interviewed, Garcia Robles, V.L. Israelyan Interview 121
Session Opens 124
Israelyan Addresses Group 125
Interest in Soviet Initiatives 126
Resumption of Talks Noted 128

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR Early June Criticisms on U.S. Tests
(Various sources, various dates)..... 130

USSR Not To Permit U.S. Superiority 130
U.S. Justifications Rebutted 131
Link to SALT II Policy, by L. Koryavin 132
U.S. Seeks Continued Modernization 133

PRAVDA: New Zealand Minister Rebuffs U.S. Pressure
(Moscow PRAVDA, 8 Jun 86)..... 135

Soviet Government Statement on Znvironment Day
(Moscow PRAVDA, 6 Jun 86)..... 136

Mexico Summit To Renew Test Ban Proposal
(G.K. Reddy; Madras THE HINDU, 16 May 86)..... 138

Briefs
TASS Reports French Test 139
Nonnuclear Korea Urged 139

RELATED ISSUES

Soviet Army Paper Links U.S. Continued Testing, SALT II
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 8 Jun 86)..... 140

TASS Cites SIPRI Report Criticizing U.S.
(Moscow TASS, 11 Jun 86)..... 143

Soviet Academician Velikov's Book on Nuclear Winter
(Moscow Television Service, 1 Jun 86)..... 144

Mongolian Leader Backs Soviet, Bloc Initiatives
(Moscow PRAVDA, 29 May 86)..... 146

Briefs
Moscow Peace Conference 150
TASS on Paris Disarmament Conference 150

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

SOVIET PREMIER RYZHKOV'S 'STAR PEACE' MESSAGE TO UN

LD120710 Moscow TASS in English 0704 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS -- Follows the full text of the message of Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, to United Nations Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar:

The Soviet Union welcomes the United Nations' appeal to the member states to submit their considerations on the development of international cooperation in averting an arms race in space and in its peaceful exploration as an unambiguous manifestation of the will of the international community.

What it amounts to is two aspects of the single global task of stopping "star wars" preparations, leading to nuclear suicide, and countering them with the alternative of a "star peace," the exploration of outer space by the joint efforts of all countries for peaceful purposes.

The Soviet Union, in accordance with the course laid down by the 27th CPSU Congress for establishing a comprehensive system of international security, is consistently working for the total exclusion of outer space from the sphere of military preparations and its use exclusively for peaceful purposes.

I

Space exploration demands from all the states new, truly global political thinking and the renunciation of the categories of strength and military superiority. It is perfectly clear that the spread of the arms race into outer space can by no means strengthen anyone's security or make nuclear weapons "important and obsolete." Today's realities leave no state any hope to defend itself exclusively by military technology. The development of space-strike weapons would dramatically escalate the risk of nuclear war, the threat to all the states and peoples.

In the nuclear space age security can be achieved only for all and only through blocking the spread of weapons into outer space and through nuclear disarmament. This is the goal of the plan put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement on January 15, 1986, for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons in the whole world by the year 2000. It envisions that agreement on a ban on space-strike weapons be achieved already at the first stage between the USSR and the USA and at the second stage on a multilateral basis, with the compulsory participation in it of the leading industrial powers.

The process of nuclear disarmament would be harmoniously combined with the development of cooperation among states in peaceful space exploration. A considerable part of the resources released as the nuclear arms arsenals are dismantled and those resources which can be absorbed by the "star wars" program could be used to promote that cause, common to the whole of humanity.

The "star wars" preparations cannot be allowed to become irreversible, spurring on the arms race and piling up obstacles on the way to disarmament, security, economic development and peaceful cooperation in space exploration. The Soviet Union stands for a strict ban on the development, testing and deployment of space-strike weapons with effective control, including the establishment of laboratories to serve that purpose. It is also prepared for partial steps towards that ultimate goal. One of such steps could be an international agreement on the immunity of artificial earth satellites, on the prohibition of the development, testing and deployment of new anti-satellite systems and on the elimination of the existing ones.

The priority measure in preventing an arms race in space and its termination on earth is to halt all nuclear explosions on a mutual basis. Nuclear tests for "star wars" are incompatible with the spirit of the treaty banning nuclear tests in the three media, including outer space.

The treaty between the USSR and the USA on the limitation of ABM systems, the cornerstone of strategic stability, should also be strictly observed today, tomorrow and in the future. A state embarking on the path of its violation or assisting in this would incur grave responsibility.

It is our conviction that to avert an arms race in space, it is necessary to enhance as much as possible the productivity of the existing mechanism of negotiations, both bilateral and multilateral, and efficiently to use the opportunities offered by the United Nations.

It is necessary first and foremost to speed up the Geneva talks between the USSR and the USA, the purpose of which is to work out efficient agreements to prevent an arms race in space and terminate it on earth, to limit and reduce nuclear arms and to strengthen strategic stability. The proposals tabled by the Soviet side at those talks have created an essential basis for achieving prompt and effective agreements on deep cuts on nuclear weapons and on preventing an arms race in space.

We simultaneously propose that businesslike talks be started at the disarmament conference to block the emergence of weapons into outer space.

II

Space exploration today is being oriented more and more to earth, to practical business on our planet. It is time to set about tackling major space exploration projects by the joint efforts of mankind in the interests of world progress and security.

It is unreasonable to scatter and duplicate the efforts of states in space exploration. Their rational use through coordination and through the pooling of efforts would yield a cumulative effect and make realistic what one, even most advanced country, cannot accomplish singlehanded.

Cooperation among states in outer space could become a bridge for stronger trust and mutual understanding among them on earth as well. The USSR is prepared to develop it with all the states both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis. We stand for cooperation, open and attainable to all, without any discrimination, for cooperation yielding tangible benefits to the peoples. We stand for cooperation among scientists and engineers of all the countries of the world in the accomplishment of peaceful space projects to make outer space a veritable world laboratory.

The Soviet Union submits for the consideration of the international community of states the following stage-by-stage programme of joint practical actions in peaceful exploration of outer space. The three-stage programme has the aim to lay before the year 2000 solid material, political, legal and organizational "star peace" foundations.

First Stage (organizational). The study of the requirements of the peoples of the world in using space technology shall be done over a period of five years, with due account for present-day possibilities of and prospects for the development of space systems.

To consider the problem of outer space in its entirety and to agree upon the basic areas of comprehensive projects, also principles of qualitatively new, broad-scale international cooperation in its peaceful exploration it is proposed to hold not later than 1990 and international conference or a special UN General Assembly session on questions of outer space or to consider these questions at some other relevant forum. The forum would approve the programme of actions for the 1990s and for the next 10-15 years. It would institute a World Space Organization (WSO) and under its aegis specialised programmes for the realization of concrete projects of cooperation. The U.N. Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space could undertake to bring about the first-stage measures, including preparations for the conference.

In the Soviet Union's opinion, efforts should be concentrated on developing big projects of using space technology for solution of such tasks of socio-economic development, common to all countries, as
-- Communication, navigation, rescue for people on earth, in the atmosphere and outer space;
-- remote probing of the earth in the interests of agriculture, development of the natural resources of the land and the world ocean;
-- the study and preservation of the biosphere of the earth, establishment of a global weather forecasting service and notification of natural calamities;
-- the use of new sources of energy, creation of new materials and technologies, including those for medicine and biology, establishment of a number of productions with the use of deep vacuum and weightlessness.

In addition to this, considering the accumulated experience, specifically the recent success in the exploration of Halley's Comet, it is expedient to develop exploration of outer space and celestial bodies by geophysical methods and by means of automatic interplanetary stations. Proposing such projects, the Soviet Union believes that these projects should incarnate the best accomplishments of the world engineering thought, should be the result of equitable and really mutually beneficial cooperation of all states, should bring them real benefits with special account for the requirements of developing states.

In our opinion, it would be realistic and fair that the major means on the implementation of such international projects should be earmarked by the space powers and other

economically developed countries; developing states could participate in these projects on easy terms, and the least developed -- could receive scientific and technological results of the work as aid for the aims of their development. The Soviet Union declares its readiness to exchange its accomplishments in outer space, to launch peaceful space vehicles of other countries and international organizations with Soviet carrier rockets on mutually acceptable terms.

Second stage (material preparations) would embrace the first half of 1990s. It will deal with designing and creating space systems under agreed upon projects. The transition to exploitation of these or other systems would be done as soon as they are ready. Certainly, the efforts and means could initially be concentrated on priority projects, considering specifically the possibilities of early ensuring their paying back and using the experience accumulated for the solution of the subsequent tasks. The comrehensive use of space systems in the global study of the condition of the biosphere of the earth in order to elaborate and carry through concrete measures for its preservation would be one of the main tasks. In other words, on the threshold of the third millenium the states would poor their space accomplishments to save the planet earth.

Activities of the WSO would start broadening. It would get down to coordinating national space exploration plans, establishing the exchange of the results of space activities, rendering assistance to the countries, particularly those making the first space exploration steps, in getting place for their instruments and organizing experiments at space objects of other countries, encouraging broad-scale joint space projects.

The WSO would establish links and cooperation with other international organizations which carry out projects in peaceful uses of outer space. Coordination of activities of specialized international programmes of ensuring the utmost rationality and efficiency of all cooperation on a global scale would be one of the main functions of the WSO.

Third stage (of implementation). All areas of cooperation would be filled with materially tangible content by the year 2000. Launchings of appropriate spacecraft would be gradually implemented, functioning of relevant ground systems organized and specialized programmes in various spheres of space technology application would start operating on the self-repayment principle, yielding practical returns. This would promote creating organizational and material infrastructure for a whole number of major projects on joint construction of spacecraft, including orbital stations and platforms for scientific and commercial undertakings, interplanetary manned spaceships for practical exploration and use of the moon even in the first decades of the 21st century, which could be also used as a base flights to other planets. In other words, as a result of implementing the programme proposed by the USSR, near-earth outer space would be used, by joint efforts, also in the interests of all the peoples on the earth, and this would create real prerequisites for turning the terrestrial civilization into an inerterplanetary one from the very beginning of the thired millennium.

III

It is a logical and necessary step to set up a world space organization so as to coordinate efforts of states at a qualitatively new stage of cooperation in space

exploration, including the implementation of major material projects. The Soviet Union regards the WSO as a universal inter-state organization with its own charter in the form of an international treaty, associated with the U.N. through an agreement on co-operation. It would coordinate the implementation of specialized programmes. The organization would be financed primarily by countries possessing large space potentials and by other economically developed states.

The WSO's efforts would be directed towards peaceful exploration of outer space and control over observance of agreements on preventing the spread of the arms race to it as they are concluded. To exercise such a control, it would initially use technical facilities granted by powers and later -- its own facilities. The WSO would promote a possibility for all the states to use in practice achievements of space science and technology for purposes and needs of their social and economic development and would help developing countries become direct participants in the great process of space exploration.

This is the concrete "star peace" programme proposed by the Soviet Union to the world community, which firmly believes that the terrestrial civilization should enter the 21st century with this programme and not with the insane "star wars" plans.

/9365
CSO: 5200/1422

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS UN SESSION ON PEACEFUL USE OF SPACE

Session Opens

LD030838 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 3 TASS-- TASS correspondent V. Chernysgev reports:

Ways of keeping space peaceful are in the focus of attention of the session of the U.N. Committee for the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space which has opened here. The resolutions passed by the 40th session of the U.N. General Assembly on International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the Prevention of an Arms Race in it point out that the prevention of militarization of space and its use exclusively for peaceful purposes constitute one of the goals of the mankind as it enters the third millennium.

The Soviet Union is resolutely and consistently advocating the effective and drastic so solution of the two-pronged task of stoping "star wars" preparations, which point the way to nuclear suicide, and countering them with the "star peace" alternative that is, the exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes by the joint efforts of all states, V.S. Safronchyk, first deputy permanent representative of the USSR to the United Nations, stated. The USSR has formulated a plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000, which puts forward the idea of the harmonious integration of nuclear disarmament, effective measures to keep outer space peaceful and free from weapons and the broadening of international cooperation in the peaceful exploration and uses of space. The 27th CPSU Congress produced the concept of the development of a comprehensive international security system, the basic principles of which envision both the prevention of an arms race in outer space and the pooling of the efforts of states in its peaceful exploration and uses. This year, proclaimed International Year of Peace by the United Nations, coincided with a remarkable jubilee in human history: 25 years ago the first earthling, Yuriy Gagarin, citizen of the USSR blasted off into space. This coincidence is truly symbolic because man's first step in outer space became a manifestation of his care for peace on earth.

'Star Peace' Plan Proposed

LD050820 Moscow TASS in English 0653 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 5 TASS--by TASS correspondent Vycheslav Chernyshev.

The United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space on Wednesday started deliberations on the chief item on the agenda--that of how to keep outer space peaceful.

Representatives of the international community observe that attaching top priority to the question on the part of the U.N. General Assembly reflects the peoples' profound alarm over the transfer of the arms race into outer space and its transformation into an arena of armed conflicts.

This question is particularly important at a time when the aggressive circles in the United States are nurturing the sinister plans of military confrontation in outer space, said Mongolia's permanent representative at the U.N. Gendengiin Nyamdoo.

The course of the Soviet Union which counterposed its concept of "star peace" to the "star wars" plans enjoyed extensive international support, he said.

The large-scale programme for a total elimination of nuclear armaments and other weapons of mass annihilation before the end of the century provided for effective measures to prevent the militarization of outer space and broaden cooperation in its exploration and use for peaceful purposes.

The USSR's representative Boris Mayorskiy submitted on behalf of the delegations from Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia a working document on ways and means to preserve outer space for peaceful uses.

He said it was difficult to overestimate the urgency of the issue. Keeping outer space peaceful, he observed, was among the major tasks facing all of mankind, the tasks the solution of which determined the future of our planet and all world civilization.

The Soviet Union was firmly and consistently committed to the idea of barring weapons from outer space and using it exclusively for peaceful purposes.

The committee on the peaceful use of outer space was called upon to make a weighty contribution to work in three major areas on which chief emphasis should be laid, said the Soviet representative.

Those were preventing the placement of weapons in outer space, banning the development, testing and deployment of strike space systems.

That was establishing extensive international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of outer space with the participation of all states irrespective of the level of their economic and social development.

That was consolidating international legal and organizational principles of the activity on the study and use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

U.S. 'Reply' Hit

LD061051 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Excerpts] A routine session of the UN Committee on Space continues in New York. Our correspondent Vladimir Gerasichev reports.

The main task of the session participants is the search for ways and means to keep space peaceful. What is Washington's reply today to the sensible appeals being made here at the UN headquarters? President Reagan has sent a message to the American Congress demanding an increase in the annual Star Wars budget of 77 percent. Forty-six U.S. senators have voiced their concern over such a rate of increase of spending on the military space program and called on Reagan to cut Star Wars appropriations substantially. The U.S. public is also opposing the administration's plans for the implementation of Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative. But it is apparent that in the White House the hawk-like practice is asserting itself firmly, in that all reasonable arguments and appeals are rejected as long as they run counter to the interests of the military-industrial complex.

Backing for 'Star Peace'

LD110624 Moscow TASS in English 0600 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The striving of the overwhelming majority of mankind dependable to block the militarization of space was reflected by a discussion on the further development of international space law at the session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space here. The delegations of the socialist countries, supported by many representatives of nonaligned and neutral states, called for drafting international legal accords to preserve outer space as a scene of "star peace" rather than "star wars."

They are related, inter alia, to the regulation of different aspects of the practical peaceful applications of the achievements of space science and technology, and the settlement of the legal questions arising in the course of international space missions. Discussing the organisational aspects of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, speakers noted the need for the committee to study the question of the mechanism of international cooperation in averting an arms race in space and in its peaceful exploration, including the proposal on the establishment of a world space organization. Its main goal could be to contribute in every way to putting the achievements of space science and technology within the reach of all the states so that they could use them in practice to promote their social and economic development.

More strict international legal regulations on keeping outer space peaceful could become a major contribution to the accomplishment of one of the most important tasks facing mankind, Poland's representative Andrzej Kakolecki noted in this context. That task is the prevention of an arms race in outer space. Joseph Mrasek of Czechoslovakia said that both political andlegal considerations called for an early solution of the concrete international international legal problems of the exploration of space. Given the goodwill of all the participants, Soviet representative E.G. Zhukova said, that committee can cope with most complex political and legal problems of space exploration.

/9365
CSO: 5200/1422

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS CITES PROXMIRE: U.S. SPACE PROGRAMS THREATEN ABM TREATY

LD091510 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 9 TASS -- The crisis touched off by a series of major setbacks of American space technology, in particular the explosions of the reusable space shuttle Challenger, the missiles "Titan-34d" and "Delta" has brought to light even more clearly the Pentagon's leading role in the space programmes of the USA, which were camouflaged as NASA's "research" and "commercial projects".

Prior to the "Challenger" disaster, the U.S. Defence Department hoped to use with its aims almost a half of the shuttle missions, which were planned then for the period up to the end of 1988, the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT said. Yet, the series of accidents has resulted in an increase in the number of delayed top priority military launchings.

In that connection the Pentagon has already announced that the first missions of the reusable space shuttle after their resumption will be solely of a military character. By that time the Pentagon's demand for the placing in orbit of military loads, especially for experiments to create space-strike weapons, will increase so much, that, according to an expert, NASA will be right in painting the space shuttles blue, as the U.S. Air Force planes are usually painted. For a long time the military character of many outer space experiments was hushed up, pointed out John Pike, deputy director for space research of the Federation of American Scientists. Now, in his opinion there is simply no time for "purely" civilian and research missions.

The "star wars" programme is a threat to the treaty on the limitation of anti-nuclear defence systems, said prominent American political figure Senator William Proxmire. Speaking in the Senate, he stressed, that this programme has already long been implemented and that it could cost hundreds of billions of dollars, if not a trillion of dollars.

What will be its impact on the vital ABM Treaty? The senator continued. This programme will be simply destroyed. But the aim of the agreement was precisely to prevent the implementation of the projects of the kind of the "star wars." Proxmire said that a direct consequence of the deployment of ABM systems with space-based elements will be uncontrolled strategic defence weapons drive.

/9365
CSO: 5200/1422

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TV NOTES FOUNDATIONS BEHIND SDI PROGRAM

LD122317 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 12 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpts] Many political observers, including Americans, think that one of the riddles of the present-day Washington is the stubborn adherence of the administration to the Strategic Defense Initiative proclaimed by Reagan. This is more frequently called the star wars program. The fact is that in view of most specialists this program is to a considerable degree unrealistic at the present stage of the development of science and technology. Many scientific and technological problems connected with the idea of creating an antimissile umbrella have still not been solved, and it is not known when they will be solved. What is more, as is being testified by leading scientists, including American ones, even if in the coming decades the necessary discoveries are made, the creation of a 100 percent reliable system for the interception of missiles is impossible in practice. In that event the whole idea loses its sense, since without a 100 percent guarantee of the interception of nuclear-warhead missiles one cannot regard the whole system as effective, and the creation of such a system will require hundreds and hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars.

In such conditions the striving by the present-day Washington leaders to insist, contrary to common sense, on implementation of the SDI program looks like inexplicable and unfounded political stubborness. However, there is in reality an explanation for this stance by the Reagan government, and it must be thought that some of those who are currently, with assumed perplexity, shrugging their shoulders when there is talk of Washington's intention to spend vast amounts on an undertaking whose success is at least doubtful, are well aware of the real reason behind it.

The answer to the riddle is that the U.S. military-industrial corporations foresee the emergence of grave difficulties for themselves in the near future and are seeking a way to avoid them.

According to the predictions of U.S. specialists, orders for the types of weapons now being produced could begin to considerably decrease during the coming 4 years.

It is in these conditions that the U.S. military-industrial concerns required something completely new that could ensure their prosperity in the coming decade. It is for this reason that the SDI program was required -- a program which, at present estimates, will demand the expenditure of a minimum of $1 trillion.

Thus, you can see that everything is not quite as inexplicable as it might appear at first glance. The present Washington administration is guided first and foremost by the interests of the military corporations, and everything else for the administration, including the problems of the security and the economic well-being of its own people, is subordinate to this goal.

/9365
CSO: 5200/1422

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

PRC CONDEMNS SDI AT NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT CONVENTION

OW090302 Beijing XINHUA in English 0153 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Paris, June 8 (XINHUA) -- A four-day special meeting of the 5th European Nuclear Disarmament Convention ended here today, with participants expressing grave concern at the militarization of the region as well as of other parts of the world and the arms race. The meeting of 650 representatives from 38 countries from all over the world condemned the U.S. Strategic Defence Initiative and the militarization of space. It also called for the dissolution of military blocks and the creation of nuclear-free zones.

Speaking today at the closing session, Cao Xiaobing, vice secretary-general of the Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament, expressed the strong desire of the Chinese people to work for world peace and for the complete elimination of nuclear arms. He [as received] urged for a halt to the arms race and for the prevention of a new world war. "With the joint efforts of peace-loving people, world peace can be safeguarded," he said.

/6091
CSO: 5200/4042

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN RECEIVES ENVOYS--On 22 May the heads of diplomatic missions of foreign states accredited to the USSR visited the USSR Academy of Sciences Space Research Institute. Academician R.Z. Sagdeyev, director of the institute, told the foreign diplomats about international cooperation in space research. The guests familiarized themselves with the institute's laboratories and saw videos of the Vega space stations' encounter with Halley's comet. At the talk the diplomats were presented with an anthology of documents and materials on the subject "The USSR's Struggle for the Peaceful Use of Space, 1957-1985," prepared by the USSR Foreign Ministry. The meeting of the institute was organized by the USSR Foreign Ministry Protocol Section. [TASS report: "Meeting With Diplomats"] [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA (Morning Edition) in Russian 23 May 86 p 4] /9365

TASS HITS AEI-DEFENSE CONFERENCE--Washington May 30 TASS--The United States intends to involve increasingly deeper its West European allies in the "star wars" program, to make use of their scientific and technological potential to create strike space arms. This was frankly said at a conference on the impact of the Strategic Defense Initiative on national security problems held here. It was sponsored by the American Enterprise Institute, the National Defense University and the Military College of the U.S. Army. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1236 GMT 30 May 86] /9365

TASS ON 'SECRET' DOE CONFERENCE--New York June 10 TASS--A secret conference on the Strategic Defense Initiative and nuclear technology is to open at the National Research Laboratory of the U.S. Energy Department in Idaho. The conference will be attended by about 250 leading American specialists involved in Reagan's star wars program, among them well-known advocate of the outer space militarization idea, atomic scientist Edward Teller. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 10 Jun 86] /9365

CSO: 5200/1422

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S ZAMYATIN ON SOVIET PROPOSALS, 'SPIRIT OF GENEVA'

LD062123 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Interview with Leonid Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to the United Kingdom, by presenter Peter Sissons, at the USSR Embassy in London on 6 June; intercepted in progress; Zamyatin remarks in Russian with superimposed English translation -- recorded]

[Text] [Zamyatin] All countries should work together to create an atomic reactor that would take account of the accidents which have happened in various countries. With this new type of reactor, the IAEA could recommend to those countries which are going to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes. [as heard] We see that even peaceful use of atoms controlled within a reactor can cause great harm to human life. But if the atom is being used for military purposes, if it is being specifically directed for the destruction of life on earth, how dangerous it is, how uncontrolled for humanity, how great the radiation would be, and that is why all countries' efforts must be directed at making sure that atomic energy is only used for peaceful purposes. We don't have to ban nuclear energy; we have to free the world from its military applications, from missiles, bombs; to take the first step on that road is possible even now and that first step is a ban on testing nuclear weapons.

[Sissons] For practically the last year Mr Gorbachev has made a string of suggestions to the West on ending the testing of nuclear weapons, reducing stockpiles, and so on. Yet, there is still a strong body of opinion in the West, particulary in the United States, which appears unconvinced. Why haven't you been able to convince them of the Soviet Union's good faith?

[Zamyatin] We did indeed, and in the next few days our government will put forward new proposals to cut conventional weapons and forces from the Atlantic to the Urals, widespread proposals with the relevant verification. In Geneva we agreed on the direction the talks should take and we expected to go constructively. But convincing those whose aim is the opposite, whipping up the arms race, is very difficult because their aims are diametrically opposed to the goals of disarmament. Take this example: They say people do not trust the Soviet Union although the Soviet Union honors all its obligations, while the U.S. President is breaking the last agreement which exists between us and the United States to curb the arms race, SALT II.

[Sissons] You spoke earlier of the spirit of Geneva. Is that spirit now dead?

[Zamyatin] I should say rather that it must live. All countries must ensure that what was said in Geneva should continue and become reality. For that we need to talk. To negotiate from a position of strength with our country never worked for anybody. History has borne that out. If anyone said that a summit is something only Gorbachev needs and Reagan does not need it as much, that would be wrong. If they want the meeting to go on with the leaders just making friends and shaking hands while the arms race goes on in the background then there is no point. The point of a summit is that the sides should be sure they can agree at least on some important issues in the field of disarmament and verification.

[Sissons] You called earlier this week for Britain to do some new political thinking and use its leverage, its special influence with the United States. Mrs Thatcher appeared to brush it off. She said, in effect, she stood four-square with Mr Reagan. Were you disappointed with that British response?

[Zamyatin] As I understood Mrs Thatcher she calls for those agreements achieved between the Soviet Union and the United States, including SALT II, to be observed. They should be observed by both sides and this is a positive reaction. It falls in with our thinking on this issue. Now the time has come when new political thinking must prevail, not just the old idea of country "A" having links with country "B", country "A" having a special relationship with country "B", it is a question with concerns each country, that there are international issues on which every country has a contribution to make, to resolve the problems common to all of us. We think that Great Britain could at this stage make a positive contribution to reestablishing the talks on a test ban treaty.

[Sissons] Now, I'd like to talk briefly about yourself, because since you've been in London you've said some very interesting things. You are the most senior official ever to be given the London posting, the first member of the Central Committee to be the ambassador in London. Can I ask you why you are here? Is it because you are the man to launch a propaganda offensive, or is it just a job in recognition of your years of distinguished service to five other Soviet leaders.

[Zamyatin] I have not come here for propaganda. No, I came here to carry out the mission given to me by the secretary general [as heard] of our party, to do all I can to help improve and develop relations between the Soviet Union and Britain. It was me who asked to come to England and the general secretary fell in with my wishes when he sent me here. The fact I am a member of the Central Committee is no hindrance in my job.

On the contrary, it gives me more confidence in practical terms because I can base my actions on the thinking of the party and the Central Committee.

[Sissons] Do you ever feel that perhaps just as President Reagan is taking a hard line in the United States it would be easier to do business with, say Mrs Thatcher's successor if they were the British Labour Party?

[Zamyatin] You know, I like the way Mrs Thatcher conducts talks. I met here for the first time in 1984 and then again when I arrived here. I like her way of explaining her position. She is a good talker, she knows how to listen and she knows how to get over her ideas.

As for interparty relations and differences between Conservative or Labour or internal or external issues, that is your concern.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SOVIET GENERAL ON PACT PROPOSALS, SALT, ABM TREATIES, SDI

Chervov Interviewed in East Berlin

DW091843 East Berlin Domestic Service in German 1300 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Interview with Colonel-General Nikolay Chervov, departmental head in the Soviet General Staff and disarmament expert, by correspondent Klaus-Juergen Fischer in Budapest; date not given -- questions recorded in German and answers in Russian with superimposed German translation]

[Text] [Fischer] The meeting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, which will be held in Budapest tomorrow, will submit new proposals on the reduction of conventional armaments in Europe. What are those new initiatives aimed at?

[Chervov] At the forthcoming meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, the Warsaw Pact representatives will present a new, very comprehensive and important initiative that is aimed at an incisive reduction of forces and conventional armaments in Europe. The area of reduction extends from the Atlantic to the Urals. The objective of the reduction will be all component parts of ground forces and tactical air forces. That initiative was announced in principle by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 11th SED Congress in Berlin. Meanwhile it has been formulated and coordinated in detail with all Warsaw Pact members.

The new proposals are on organic part of the socialist countries' complex peace initiative which is aimed at nuclear disarmament and the liquidation of all means of mass destruction. The main point now is the reduction of the military capabilities to a reasonable level. We mean disarmament at such a low level that an offensive strike is impossible. Naturally that has to be on a mutually acceptable basis. The most important thing about that initiative is that it can strengthen security in Europe.

[Fischer] How do you as a military man assess the U.S. Administration's decision to withdraw from SALT II by the end of the year? What countermeasures would the Soviet Union take?

[Chervov] Viewed from a military standpoint, the U.S. Administration's decision is nothing but the destruction of the treaty system on the limitation of strategic arms, which are the most powerful arms. All barriers against the arms race are abolished. Since 1980, Washington has tried to destroy SALT II under various pretexts. Now the U.S. armament program has reached a stage where the new missiles exceed the limits of SALT II. That treaty interferes with the U.S. military program. Therefore, Washington wants to throw the obligations under that document overboard by the end of the year.

Washington applies a similar tactic against the ABM Treaty. The so-called Strategic Defense Initiative envisages the development of space weapons that are banned under that treaty. The Washington administration has already started attacking that important document. The recent decision by the U.S. Administration counteracts the consolidation of international security and stability. It can only lead to a further intensification of tension. Mankind is sitting on a (?huge) mountain of arms anyway. That mountain would be growing ever more.

What could the socialist countries do in this situation? They must take measures. Because SALT II also limits the Soviet Union's strategic arms, we would have to increase the number of warheads on our missiles and other means of delivery if the Americans adhere to their decision. Of course, that would not be the Soviet Union's choice. We have always advocated retaining the existing treaties, including the important SALT II agreement.

We have in the past observed all contractual obligations and are ready to continue to do that on a mutual basis. That also applies to the obligations arising from the SALT and ABM treaties.

[Fischer] Do you see any way out of the current deadlock of the Geneva negotiations?

[Chervov] Indeed, the Geneva negotiations have now definitely reached a deadlock. The U.S. side is blocking the talks due to its stance on the militarization of space. It wants to be given the right to deploy weapons in space. We are supposed to agree with the Americans on the way in which space is to be militarized. That is unacceptable. We want to keep space forever free of weapons. They also are not ready to solve other problems.

We are of the view -- and that line is also supported by the international public -- that it is absolutely necessary to retain the ABM Treaty that bans space-based missile defense systems, among other things. It is the last element of the arms limitation building, so to speak. Therefore, we suggested concretely that the U.S. side clearly state that it wants to continue the treaty. We could sign a bilateral statement that we would not withdraw from the obligations arising from the ABM Treaty in the next 15 or 20 years. We also suggested concretely that a line be drawn between space research prohibited by the ABM Treaty and permissible space research. We know very well that the so-called basic research cannot be prohibited. We are not against such research, even though some people try to impute that to us time and again. We want to draw such a line very concretely and one-sidedly.

If the United States is ready to agree with us on the observance of the ABM Treaty and if it renounces the militarization of space, that would be a way out of the deadlock. Regarding other problems, there are concrete proposals on the table. The only thing that is necessary is the U.S. political willingness.

'Panorama' Interview on SALT II, SDI

LD122228 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1955 GMT 12 Jun 86

["Exclusive Interview with Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, departmental head at the USSR General Staff, by unidentified correspondent; date and place not given -- from the "Panorama" program]

[Text] [Announcer] We can truly say that the eyes of the world were on Budapest, not least to see what sort of political and military decisions were made by the leaders of our alliance system in the present responsible historical moment, when President Reagan is about to tear up the SALT II agreement, which, although it has never been ratified, has nonetheless been observed for the past 7 years, and when the United States is making a serious beginning on the implementation of the star wars program, also known as the Strategic Defense Initative.

The deputy head of the Soviet General Staff gave an exclusive interview to "Panorama" at the end of the session. In this interview he discusses the position adopted by the Warsaw Pact summit on these issues and other, very interesting, military issues. Our first question concerned the military aspects of the decisions of the Budapest summit.

[Begin recording] [Chervov in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] The most significant military aspect of the Budapest session is the new initiative by the countries of the Warsaw Pact aimed at a significant reduction in European military forces and conventional armaments, which would extend to the entire European Continent from the Urals to the Atlantic. The reduction would apply to every component of the land forces and tactical air forces. We are putting forward reliable means of verification in these proposals, particularly regarding verification of the significant reduction in the armed forces and of the military activities of the forces that remain after the reduction.

Naturally, this initiative, if it is accepted by the European countries, if it is accepted by the NATO countries, will represent a significant step from the point of view of the security of Europe.

[Correspondent] Of course, the Pentagon could object that if the Soviet forces were to be withdrawn to beyond the Urals, they could be brought back rapidly at any time.

[Chervov] Of course, there can be such absurd objections, but then we can also come up with objections like this against the American side. The Americans have the same possibility of moving forces from overseas to the European Continent, as well as moving military technology and armaments.

[Correspondent] Comrade Colonel General, what sort of military consequences might follow if the United States finally abandons SALT II?

[Chervov] The main consequence would unquestionably be the beginning of an unrestricted arms race in every direction, particularly toward the development -- and what is more -- the uncontrollable development of strategic strike weapons. After all, even though the U.S. Administration is denigrating the SALT II, saying that it is outdated, that it is no use anymore, SALT II has stipulations that places a

restraint on military programs, American and Soviet alike. For example the treaty states that on an aircraft there can be 20 maneuverable cruise missiles and no more, that on another aircraft, the B-52, for example, there can be 28 cruise missiles and no more. There are also stipulations according to which the two sides cannot build new types of ICBM's cannot exchange their light missiles for heavy ones, and so on. There are a lot of restrictions of this sort. If the American side tears up SALT II, all these restrictions will cease to exist. In other words, both sides will develop their armaments as they see necessary, and consequently there will begin a very dangerous race, the race of the most powerful strategic weapons.

The second consequence of the fact that the U.S. Administration has made such an irresponsible decision is that in practice the entire system of agreements on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons will vanish. In other words, everything that has been created by four previous U.S. Administrations and the Soviet Union. With this decision they are in practice casting this entire system of agreements on the garbage heap and the development of strategic armaments will begin, as the U.S. Government has announced, in accordance with their own judgement.

[Correspondent] The White House, of course, claims that you violated the stipulations of SALT II even before they did.

[Chervov] That is disinformation. What is more, it is malicious disinformation. The Soviet Union takes a very responsible position regarding all its agreements, all the obligations it undertakes, and meets them conscientiously and fully. The American side has, in practice, two complaints against us -- or rather, it accuses us of two violations of the agreement. These are the encoding of telecommunications data and the creation of a second, new type of missile. In fact, the American side is perfectly aware that this is not so. There is no violation of any treaty here.

Their accusations are completely groundless. What SALT II says is that the two sides, when testing their missiles, can encode the telecommunication data, with the exception of those which are needed for verifying observance of the treaty. Thus the treaty does not forbid encoding, rather, it permits it, but within limits.

What is it that must not be encoded? The starting mass, the length of the missile, the type of propellant used and the diameter of the missile? These things we do not encode. This is something that the Americans can see very well and there is no need for them to make any sort of complaints against the Soviet side. We have said to the Americans: If you object to the fact that we have encoded something, let us come to an agreement. Tell us what it is that, in your view, we have encoded. Name it and then let us come to an agreement about what can be and what must not be encoded. We will reply to your questions. The American side does not name those parameters. If it does not name them, it is like saying: Go there, but I do not know where.

[Correspondent] If the United States were to make a serious start on what they call the Strategic Defense Initiative, what we call star wars, what Soviet countermeasures can we expect?

[Chervov] Realization of the SDI program would sweep the entire world into very dangerous regions. At the Budapest session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee, all the leaders of the socialist countries unanimously and firmly condemned these star wars plans as an adventurist policy that would be a threat to the world as a whole. The socialist countries possess the economic and intellectual resources to bring in countermeasures. It is not at all necessary for us to create a similar space shield in order to defend the socialist countries. There is no need. Mikhail Sergeyevich

Gorbachev has stressed on several occasions that we have possibilities of thwarting such things, even by choosing other paths. We can break this space shield. This space shield is vulnerable. The tragedy of the Challenger showed that the whole SDI system has a number of vulnerable elements. Thus, countermeasures are possible through the development of strategic-strike weapons. In this case, making reductions in strategic-strike weapons would become impossible; on the contrary, they would have to be developed and perfected. In which direction is development progressing? Well, if they build a space shield, the strategic-strike weapons can be low-flying, maneuverable, or floating.

[Correspondent] What was that expression you used?

[Chervov] Low-flying, with a low trajectory, so that the space shield will not be able to destroy them. So, this is the way. Finally, there is stealth technology and a host of other solutions which, of course, we now have to review. Soviet scientists have received their task and are carrying them out with the help of the socialist countries. Unquestionably, the countermeasures will be reliable, so that the efforts of the U.S. side to attain military superiority through space, so that it will become the leading power in the world and able to enforce its will on the world, is an illusion.

[Correspondent] According to many American critics of SDI, the negative feature of SDI is precisely that it is an umbrella with a lot of holes in it.

[Chervov] This is precisely so. It is very vulnerable as well. The guidance system is vulnerable from the aspect of the computers; consequently the countermeasures will move along precisely those paths where the vulnerable points of this space shield are.

[Correspondent] On Monday, Mikhail Gorbachev, speaking at the Csepel factory, spoke in great detail about the political (?lessons) of Chernobyl. What influence is Chernobyl exerting on purely military topics?

[Chervov] Nuclear weapons must be eliminated. Because, what is Chernobyl? A miserable little nothing, smaller than the smallest atomic bomb and, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at the Csepel factory, there are now tens of thousands of them and these are genuine nuclear weapons. Using them would be, in one word, apocalypse.

The events in Chernobyl demonstrated the complete absurdity of the concept and doctrines of a limited nuclear war, their adventurist character. It is adventurist to think it is possible to carry out strikes with surgical precision against selected targets. A single nuclear strike is sufficient for a catastropehe to come about. What happened in Chernobyl range the alarm bells for the whole world; nuclear tests must be banned. [End recording]

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA: GDR'S HONECKER BACKS GORBACHEV ARMS CURB PROPOSALS

PM281126 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 24 May 86 p 4

[TASS report: "Full Support"]

[Text] Berlin, 23 May--GDR citizens fully support the extensive Soviet initiatives aimed at ridding the world of all types of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 and at creating a system of universal security. This was said by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, at a rally in Soemmerda. The GDR leader toured Erfurt Bezirk, where he familiarized himself with the work of a number of enterprises.

The GDR, E. Honecker noted, welcomes the proposals put forward by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev at the 11th SED Congress on substantial cuts in conventional arms and armed forces in Europe. These initiatives, along with the Soviet Union's extension of its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests to 6 August, provide the peoples of the world with an enormous opportunity to make progress on the path of nuclear disarmament. U.S. abandonment of nuclear tests and willingness to have constructive talks with the USSR would be an important step toward eliminating the nuclear threat that faces mankind. The GDR leader roundly condemned the U.S. "star wars" plans, stating that anyone who supports the so-called SDI program, as the FRG Government does, is responsible for spreading the arms race to space and thus for exacerbating the international situation as a whole.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1420

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS ON GENEVA MEETINGS 3-12 JUNE

Space Weapons Group 3 June

LD031121 Moscow TASS in English 1057 GMT 3 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 3 Jun (TASS)--A meeting of the group on space weapons has been held here within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and outer space weapons.

Strategic Arms Group 4 June

OD041210 Moscow TASS in English 1118 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 4 Jun (TASS)--A meeting of the group on Strategic Arms was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms.

Space Arms Group 10 June

LD101129 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 10 Jun (TASS)--The group on space armaments held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nucler and space armaments.

INF Group 5 June

LD051326 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 5 Jun (TASS)--A session of the group for medium-range nuclear weapons was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

Plenary Meeting 11 June

LD111107 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 11 Jun (TASS)--The delegations of the USSR and the USA at the talks on nuclear and space arms held a plenary meeting here today at the initiative of the USSR delegation. The group on strategic offensive arms

met on the same day within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and strategic arms.

INF Group 12 June

LD121121 Moscow TASS in English 1105 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva, 12 Jun (TASS)--The medium-range nuclear weapons group has had a meeting here today at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1420

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW ON EUROPEAN INTEREST BREAKING 'DEADLOCK'

LD091541 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 8 Jun 86

[From the "Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov "of the North American service of Radio Moscow" with "our usual panel" Profs Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] The topic for today is Soviet-American relations seen in a broader context, namely in the framework of East-West relations. Being a European nation the Soviet Union attaches great significance to what's going on on the European Continent. This geographical factor is not the only one which warrants such a level of attention to the European situation. Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] You know I would like to link your question with the very sad event in Chernobyl. And you may ask me what it has to do with the European situation. And my answer is very simple. Just imagine for a while that a cruise missile from, for instance, Holland, was launched to the Soviet Union and Chernobyl was destroyed; this station was destroyed by the cruise from Holland. You know what that would mean?

[Kuznetsov] To the Dutch?

[Bogdanov] To the Dutch. It would mean the same as it means for us. The Dutch will suffer, though the cruise missile was launched from their territory, they suffer the same consequences because of the radiation, because of all these consequences, as we will suffer.

[Kuznetsov] You mean without our retaliatory strike?

[Bogdanov] Without our retaliatory strike. Now you may now understand at what I am aiming at: How closely all these problems are connected, and it's quite natural that NATO's policy on the European Continent is of great interest to us because of our security. Now I hope that it would be of the same interest to NATO's members and the American allies because of that very sad event which may be judged from that point of view too. What worries me, you know, I've been close, following very closely the last, the last NATO session. They have taken a decision, they have agreed to binaries, you know, being produced, but you know, all, even American allies, even American journalists, for instance Drew Middleton, noticed one thing, American military unilateralism, and I believe that unilateralism, American military unilateralism, it's a very big thing for discussion and for deliberation around this round table.

[Kuznetsov] Most scenarios of world war III describe a major confrontation in Europe, or a deep political crisis, as that first shot that would lead to a major confrontation and the movie "The Day After" is the first thing that comes to mind. In this respect my question to you, Professor Plekhanov: If there is a more active Europe in terms of arms control and disarmament, number one, can the United States benefit from this? And number two, would it be a more assertive European role in arms control, in establishing a better international climate, seen as a Soviet effort to split the ranks, as it is often described? Any initiative from the Soviet Union is seen as a wedge driven to split the allied ranks.

[Plekhanov] Yes, well, you know, splitting the ranks, that argument is used very often by the United States these days, and it's ironic that there's very little discussion, it sounds like a military command given to a line of soldiers standing, you know, and if this parallel, if we continue this parallel then, it's not the business of the privates to question the wisdom of the commands which are given to them, they are just to follow orders and indeed this line does sound like ordering the allies about without really letting them question the wisdom.

Now I think that when Margaret Thatcher, the British prime minister, voiced strong criticism of the Reagan administration's decision to break out of the SALT II treaty, I think that reflected the uneasiness even among the very close allies of the United States in Europe, uneasiness about this trend. And I, in reference to the first part of your question, I happen to believe that it is in the interests of the United States that Europe play a more active role and assert itself to a greater extent on questions of security, rather than just follow blindly the traditional precepts of what is called the Atlantic solidarity. I think that Atlantic solidarity, if there is a lot, real solidarity across the Atlantic Ocean, it need not be strengthened by such things as joint participation in the star wars. Of course there are links between the United States and Western Europe, historic links, cultural links, social, economic, what have you, and nobody in the Soviet Union questions those links. But when it's a joint endeavor in order to create a new danger both for Europe and for the world at large and for the United States, we have to question the wisdom of this blindly obeying American orders.

[Kuznetsov] As far as I understand, quite a number of Western European officials are torn between what is described as allied unity and the keen sense of survival. Survival is very much present on our minds as well. What do you think some NATO members can do to take the arms control process out of this current deadlock? Are there any ways, say Great Britain or other countries can contribute to this?

[Bogdanov] Your question is a very good one, you know. We understand that our European, American allies, NATO's members, they have a lot of difficulties, some of them political, some of them, if you like, military, some of them economical, but I'm absolutely sure, Pavel, that all of us on our European Continent, we are trying to find out some ways to defuse the situation and to find out some ways to approach arms control problems in some one way or the other. And I would like to emphasize, you know, that we may believe that America will go out of Europe but we are very realistic people, pragmatic people, and we are always thinking in terms of what is possible, not something, you know, imaginable, and we understand that Europe and the United States for many reasons they are one (?life), one union, NATO and things like that. But it doesn't mean that we should live on one continent as a hostile, you know, power, waiting for a war to break out from one day from the other. Europe is stuck to the peace by nuclear weapons. Let me quote a very recent event. Our leader met with the home minister, member of the ruling Conservative Party, Lord Whitelaw (?in the Kremlin) and to my mind he has suggested very interesting things to Britain.

[Kuznetsov] For some time major American allies in Europe insisted on the Soviet Union and the United States taking a lead in arms control. But we have a situation when the United States not only refuses to stop testing but has threatened to break out of the SALT II treaty. And this is what I meant by suggesting that West Europeans could play a more assertive role in arms control, like during that meeting with Lord Whitelaw, Mikhail Gorbachev suggested that the Soviet Union and Great Britain could have a joint initiative on a test ban. On one of our programs we mentioned Great Britain as one of the parties (?during) the trilateral talks on test ban in the late seventies they were broken off by the United States in 1980. When the United States, in my view, refuses to cooperate in the field of arms control, this should not be an end to our hopes.

[Plekhanov] You know, I think this is a very important undertaking and it's good that you emphasized it because, indeed, there is some frustration among some people (?while) the Soviet Union keeps up -- keeps coming up with new initiatives, and the United States refuses to discuss them or rejects them. What do you do in that situation? Do you forget about new initiatives, do you join the United States in the arms race, do you support the American approach to matters of nuclear weapons, or do you continue to press for it, to discuss these things with other nuclear powers?

I think that, of course, we are at a crossroads now, the situation is getting very dangerous and it's simply a duty of our government, maybe the most important duty, definitely the most important duty, to do whatever it can. I recall the old adage from back in the thirties; I think that that's a British saying. You know, a son asked the father: What did you do in the war, Daddy? And he said: Well, I tried to prevent the bloody thing. It's good to -- I mean, it's necessary to do everything possible to prevent the bloody thing, there will be no fathers and sons to discuss the matter afterwards.

[Bogdanov] But still there are fathers and sons.

[Plekhanov] There are now.

[Bogdanov] And still we invite our American [word indistinct].

[Plekhanov] Yes, while there are.

[Bogdanov] Yes, to join us in preventing this bloody thing.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, our time is up. That was "Top Priority," a weekly panel discussion from Radio Moscow. I am Pavel Kuznetsov. Good-bye till next time at the same wavelengths, a week from now.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1420

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

MOSCOW TALK SHOW VIEWS U.S., SOVIET ATTITUDES

LD062117 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 6 Jun 86

["International Situation — Questions and Answers" program presented by Konstantin Patsyuk, All-Union Radio commentator, with Professor Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, doctor of historical sciences and deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Vladimir Vasiliyevich Peresada, international affairs journalist; Viktor Anikin, Lisbon correspondent; Vyacheslav Lavrentyev (not further identified); Sergeyev Pravdin, commentator]

[Excerpts] [Patsyuk] Viktor Vasilyevich Rybin from the town of Kataysk in Kurgan Oblast dwells in his letter on Soviet-American relations. He expresses concern at the fact that these relations are tense -- and not through the fault of the Soviet Union. The world situation is such, he notes, that we cannot postpone a solution of the problem of the normalization of Soviet-American relations. We have asked Prof Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, doctor of historical sciences and deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to express his thoughts on the state of these relations. Over to you:

[Bogdanov] Well, Konstantin Nikolayevich, the question of Comrade Viktor Vasilyevich Rybin is evidence that he belongs to the category of our listeners who follow attentively the development of the international situation. And of course his attention cannot fail to be attracted by the process of serious deterioration in Soviet-American relations that has been taking place for a long time. It seems to me that Comrade Rybin gives a totally correct evaluation of the present state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It is of course a bad thing that Soviet-American relations are not being smoothed out but are slipping down an incline. The two great countries' significance in world politics is too great; their nuclear arsenals are too great. And it has long since become clear to many millions of inhabitants of the globe that if these arsenals were to once be set in motion, the very existence of world civilization would be in question.

Unfortunately, among the leadership of the greatest nuclear power of the capitalist world — the United States -- which in political science is customarily taken to mean the U.S. Administration, illusions continue to prevail to this day about the possibility of winning the arms race, of gaining victory in a nuclear war, and, in general, of attaining superiority over the Soviet Union. I should like to note that this is all in flagrant contradiction to the provisions of the Soviet-American communique that was signed in Geneva in November of last year after the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan.

[Bogdanov] Despite the negative reaction in the United States, we have again and again extended the moratorium and are thereby giving the American Administration a chance to go its part of the way, to respond with reciprocity -- in even one matter -- to the Soviet Union's proposal. The main word of this administration -- as if it were its catchword, its slogan -- is a constant "no." In the final analysis, the upper hand in it has been gained by those forces, those groups, that always opposed any agreements with the Soviet Union, considering them to be dangerous to the United States, and that are convinced that a regime of confrontation -- and forceful confrontation -- is precisely the field of action in which it is easiest for them to play, where -- due to their many years of experience -- they feel like a fish in water. The dream of these figures is to draw the Soviet Union onto a lethal field of confrontation and attempt to compel it to play according to its rules. The field of peace, international security, and cooperation in which the Soviet Union operates is not acceptable to these people. They are afraid of it. They simply cannot live in an atmosphere of goodwill and decency. These people's hate for our country is too great, their ideas about the contemporary world are too primitive.

[Patsyuk] Our listeners are naturally interested in the question: What about a Soviet-American meeting? What is the situation regarding it now?

[Bogdanov] The Soviet side is in favor of such a meeting. And we are not putting forward any preconditions. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted, a new meeting should solve the problems that are worrying the whole world. Major questions should be taken to that meeting. For one cannot in fact continue the dialogue without resolving anything; one cannot step up the arms race and use the meeting as a screen to conceal that arms race. The Soviet side is not in agreement with this. But, unfortunately, this is the position of the American Administration. For our part, we are open to compromise solutions, but we shall never undertake unilateral concessions. Neither political, nor economic, nor military pressure will have an effect on us. Any agreement must be the result of constructive talks. A meeting could be productive, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted at his meeting with Japanese Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe, if the approach to it, the creation of the necessary atmosphere for holding it, is rid of illusions concerning the motives for Soviet interest in that meeting.

[Patsyuk] You have already spoken of the American Administration's decision in practice not to observe in the future Soviet-American agreements on strategic arms limitation. Please tell us about this in more detail.

[Bogdanov] I should like to draw your attention to the time when this was done, and I want to draw your attention to something that is now even more obvious: Why is the American Administration taking such an unconstructive position at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons and on the question of what form the new Soviet-American summit meeting should take? The Soviet position that, for the holding of such a meeting, the American side be prepared to attain specific results, at least in one or two questions in the area of security, and that the existence of the appropriate political atmosphere is essential, appears even more justified. For this and other provocative steps that have been taken by the United States do not testify to its intensions to settle its differences with the Soviet Union. Of course, such a development of events gives rise to concern in all of us. But all postwar historical experience testifies that we possess sufficient potential to deprive the United States of the opportunity to achieve unilateral advantages.

|Peresada| The American-Israeli agreement on strategic cooperation, legalized in 1983, became the crowning point of the line to link the actions of the United States and Israel and to globalize the Arab-Israeli conflict. Since then it has been constantly expanding and becoming ever more active. The military plans of the partners are coordinated, in particular on conducting joint maneuvers. An exchange of intelligence data takes place. American weapons which -- as, incidentally, has often been reported -- can be used not only by the United States itself but also by Tel Aviv, are stored on Israel's territory. And recently Israel officially joined the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative that is, Reagan's star wars program.

This is a most dangerous step. It means that Israel is becoming an accomplice in the American Adminstration's wide confrontation schemes, in its plans aimed at the militarization of space and at breaking the existing military-strategic balance in the world. In the statement to the Government of Israel, made through corresponding diplomatic channels, the Soviet Union warned it of that measure of responsibility that the Israeli leadership is taking on itself, thereby facilitating the aggravation of general tension in the world and therefore in the Near East too.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1420

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR: U.S., ALLIED REACTION TO REAGAN SALT II DECISION

UK Tories Evince 'Alarm, Anxiety'

LD301746 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1259 GMT 30 May 86

[Text] London, 30 May (TASS)--U.S. President Reagan's statement about the intention of his administration to leave the framework of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty later this year, has been met in English political circles, including the ruling party, with deep alarm and anxiety.

Nicolas Soames, prominent Tory figure, secretary of the Conservative Party Foreign Affairs Committee and member of parliament, characterized these plans of Washington as "reckless and extremely dangerous." In the statement, which has been distributed here today, he emphasized that the United States "has to remain in the framework of the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty." This is in the interests of all, including the West, noted the member of parliament.

Paris Paper Cited

LD311137 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Paris, May 31 TASS--U.S. threats to stop observing the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-2) signed by the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. were the cause of serious differences between the delegates who attended the recent session of the NATO council in Halifax, Canada, at the level of foreign ministers, LE MONDE wrote.

Even before the session Prime Minister Brian Mulroney of Canada expressed opposition to the renunciation of SALT-2. The arguments advanced by the U.S. President in favor of stopping the observance of the treaty are not convincing enough, LE MONDE said. Soviet-American talks on disarmament and arms control are completely stalled because of the stand of the United States which advanced its "Strategic Defense Initiative". The paper emphasized that the renunciation of the SALT-2 treaty would obviously lead to a new round of uncontrolled race in offensive arms.

The United States has not informed its NATO allies about its intention to reconsider the U.S. attitude to the SALT-2 treaty, QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS said. This caused concern and even hostility on the part of NATO West European member-countries.

CBS: Reagan 'Under Fire'

LD020529 Moscow TASS in English 0521 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Text] Washington, June 2 TASS--The Reagan Administration has found itself under fire for its decision to discard the SALT-2 treaty. This is how the CBS TV network has commented on the international reaction to the announcement of the White House of a virtual refusal of the United States to observe in future the Soviet-U.S. agreements on limiting strategic offensive arms. According to the CBS, even the closest allies of the USA unanimously and resolutely declared against the decision. CBS quoted a statement by Joe Clark, Canadian secretary of state for external affairs, who had described the step of the White House as leading to an extremely disquieting development of events.

Warnke: Reagan's 'Blunder'

LD061010 Moscow TASS in English 0953 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 6 TASS--Paul Warnke, a noted politician who headed the U.S. delegation at the talks on drafting the SALT-2 treaty called "a tragic blunder" the U.S. President's decision to renounce the provisions of this document. He emphasized during the debate sponsored by the Association of Arms Control advocates that this step meant the loss of everything positive achieved earlier. It will be detrimental not only to arms control but will have a negative influence on the bilateral relations in all the spheres. Warnke called this decision rash and unjustifiable from all points of view--military and political, as well as from the viewpoint of U.S. security.

The renunciation of the treaty means the loss of everything positive achieved during its preparation, renunciation of the policy of mutual restraint, said Warnke. There is a glaring contradiction between statements and actions of the administration. Speaking of its desire for raising the level of U.S. security but renouncing the SALT-2 treaty, the USA will contribute, thereby, to larger arsenals of strategic weapons. This does not conform to the country's interests. The decision taken will make much more difficult the entire process of arms control and can undermine grounds for negotiations.

The U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Warnke pointed out, declared during the preparation and signing of the SALT-2 treaty that there was parity in strategic weapons between the two countries. In the past years the Soviet Union has cut the number of ICBM launchers. Now it will be forced to take counter-measures. U.S. security will not gain by this, despite assurances by advocates of the "Star Wars" programme. There can be no higher level of security if the two sides increase stockpiles of strategic weapons.

The President's decision has also caused incomprehension among NATO allies. It is detrimental not only to arms control but will have a negative influence on the bilateral relations in all the spheres.

Observation of the treaty's provisions provided the basis for search of new ways and for working out compromise solutions. Now this basis can disappear, noted Warnke.

Criticism in U.S., Abroad

LD062000 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1447 GMT 6 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Excerpt] Mankind is at present experiencing anxiety once again. Unfortunately, the peoples of the world have grave grounds for this--namely, the recent actions of the U.S. administration. The latter has to all intents and purposes given up complying in the future with the Soviet-American documents on limiting strategic offensive armaments.

Even in the United States itself, in Congress, in scientific circles, and among the broad sections of the population, there is growing criticism of the President. The White House is being condemned too by the international press. What is more, yesterday it had fresh grounds for doing so, namely yet another nuclear-weapon test in Nevada. The newspapers note that by carrying out the test, which is the 12th since the introduction by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, Washington is totally neglecting the appeals by the world and the American publics.

European Reaction Reviewed

LD061807 Moscow TASS in English 1754 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS -- By TASS Political News Analyst Aleksey Grigoryev:

The West German newspaper WESTDEUTSCHER ALLGEMEINE published a commentary that dotted all "I"'s and corssed all "T"'s . The paper said: "There were periods of uncertainty in the North Atlantic alliance before. However, rarely have the signs of a division shown themselves as clearly as after President Reagan's statement about the virtual refusal to observe the SALT-2 limits."

Yes, one can clearly see the disquiet of Washington's allies. According to THE TIMES of London, Canada stated at the NATO Council session in Halifax that it was "deeply concerned" about President Reagan's decision, and West Germany in its turn declared that the decision could become a "potential disaster" for the arms control process. "The shock therapy" used by the United States with respect to its NATO partners (the Libyan adventure, the veto on the draft agreement worked out at the Bern meeting on human contacts, the torpedoing of SALT-2) did not have a positive impact on them at all. There is little doubt that the European governments, as Willy Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and president of the Socialist International, said a few days ago in Bonn, "by their subservient behavior with regard to the American ally, and neglecting the European interests, support those officials in the U.S. Administration who are out to turn the spirit of Geneva into a ruin of the American-Soviet rapprochement."

However, these governments, too, have to use the entire account of political rhetoric in a bid to justify their pro-American policies and parry wrathful criticism from the parliamentary opposition.

During the debates in the House of Commons June 3 Margaret Thatcher, the British prime minister, stated several times it was "important that the SALT-2 agreement should continue to be observed by both sides." She simply could not fail to say this without the risk of sawing off the bough on which her cabinet is sitting. But the instant later in a classic demonstration of the saying "to put a good face on the matter" Mrs Thatcher said that President Reagan actually observed SALT-2 and left the door open for the Soviet Union to comply with the treaty.

The reaction from Roy Hattersley, deputising for Neil Kinnock, the opposition leader, was swift.

The Parliament and the country, he said understand well why the prime minister is unwilling to give a direct answer to the question. Mr. Hattersley accused the prime minister of humiliating herself and Britain by always dancing to President Reagan's tune.

The interview of Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the West German foreign minister, to the Hessen radio was a tormenting experience -- for the former. The head of the West German foreign affairs department could not but admit that in Halifax the European partners of the United States and their Canadian colleague advocated the continued compliance with the SALT-2 agreement, and that the Federal Government of West Germany had repeatedly stated its interest in preserving SALT-2. But then the minister, perhaps feeling Washington's spell, began to speak at large about a creative policy which met the interests of the European partners and aimed for finding ways to preclude the emergence of problems which Europeans might regard as a result of non-compliance with SALT-2.

The situation in which Hans-Dietrich Genscher found himself was all the more peculiar since a number of figures in the ruling Christian-Liberal coalition in West Germany evidently had no doubt as to whether they should support the dangerous policy of the United States. It is difficult to imagine, the newspaper KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER wrote, that Lutz Stafenchagen, the minister of state in the West German Foreign Ministry, could contradict the federal minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. However, Stafenchagen's views on the Soviet-American SALT-2 treaty, officially formulated on the information memos of the Federal Foreign Ministry, seem to be strange. Genscher stands for the observance of the treaty limits, while his own minister of state speaks of the broad understanding of President Reagan's intentions. As to the parliamentary opposition in West Germany, the Social Democratic group in the Bundestag submitted a draft resolution which called upon the Bonn government, other Western European allies and Canada to make everything to persuade the United States to continue complying with the SALT-2 provisions.

Such sentiments are characteristic of other countries of the Old World. Europe will fight for SALT-2, THE GUARDIAN newspaper predicted. It is a fight from which one cannot stay away and which should not be fought in an off-handed manner.

World 'Perturbed'

LD062255 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 6 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Igor Kudrin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The world is perturbed. As you know the United States intends to wreck the treaty on strategic arms limitations. The U.S. public is disturbed. Washinton's West European allies are also worried. How else are the members of the U.S. Administration trying to justify their position, particularly, Secretary of Defense Weinberger. The mildest word he finds to define this document is "defective" [porochnyy]. They want to instill in the public that this treaty is only advantageous to the Soviet Union and does not in any way meet the national interests of the United States. It has been no secret that for some time the President and his immediate entourage have never been enthusiatic admirers of treaties on arms control. They are not thinking of concealing this even today.

I would like to cite an excerpt from an article published in the West German paper FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU. By the way the article is titled, "What? An End to SALT II." This is what the article says: Reagan sees in the Soviet Union only an evil empire. One cannot trust communists, he believes. How then in that case should partnership in the field of security work? Well, the question is a legitimate one. It is being posed today by millions of people. They are waiting, from the head of the White House, concrete decisions, reassuring words again in favor of peace. And the President is in fact talking, but what is he saying?

Over the past week President Reagan had several public meetings in front of completely different audiences on completely different issues. Nevertheless the topic of building up military might runs through all the President's speeches. He talked about this in particular at a Marine base.

This speech was even assessed by the U.S. media as an integral part of the present campaign by the administration aimed at defending an inflated military budget. How is the arms race justified? By the alleged indisputable military advantage of the Soviet Union, its imaginary uncompromising stance at talks, the striving by the United States to strengthen its national security, and the onslaught generally of communism in various regions of the earth, which the United States has to repluse decisively. This, in the language of the head of the White House, is called the strategy of defense on foremost frontiers. Thanks only to the implementing of this strategy, accoridng to him, is freedom on the march, on the upsurge, on the crest of a wave.

This comes from a speech by the President in front of veterans of the Office of Strategic Services of the United States now, where Reagan said, I quote: Our secret service, our spys, and our intelligence departments have written a thrilling chapter in our history.

No doubt it was flattering for the CIA veterans to hear these kind words -- all the more so as they are rarely praised. On the whole they are exposed for criminal activity in various regions in the world. For this department has in its arsenal murder, kidnapping, bribery, and blackmail.

'Storm of Indignation' in U.S. Congress

LD072220 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Jun 86

[From the "International Diary" program; presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] [Surguchev] Hello, comrades. In recent days the attention of the international public has been focused on the question of the future of two Soviet-American agreements on the limiting of strategic armaments in connection with the decision you know about of the Reagan administration to cease observing these agreements. Throughout the world, serious concern is being expressed at the refusal by the White House to respect the provisions of SALT II and the agreement on the limiting of antimissile defense systems. In such a U.S. stance a threat is perceived that the whole system of the treaties, aimed at bridling the strategic arms race, may be wrecked, and not without grounds.

In the United States itself, how is the decision of official Washington to ignore the restrictions laid down by SALT II and the antimissile defense agreement being received? I will begin our conversation with Vladimir Gerasichev, the correspondent in New York, with this question. Vladimir Aleksandrovich, can you hear me?

[Gerasichev] Yes, I can hear you well. I would say that on Capitol Hill there is a storm of indignation. Congressmen, both Democrats and Republicans, are demanding that the administration review its attitude toward SALT II, which for all intents and purposes is refusing to observe beginning this autumn. Leaders of the Democratic congressmen have stated directly that if necessary they will introduce a bill that will ban the allocation of funds for the production of cruise missiles for U.S. bombers over the limit envisioned by the treaty.

[Surguchev] It turns out that in Congress there is fairly serious opposition to the President's decision.

[Gerasichev] Yes, this is quite true. Such opposition exists not only in the Congress but also outside. The press is full right now with statements by public and political figures criticizing the administration for embarking on a course toward breaking the existing accords.

[Surguchev] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, the White House, in justifying its decision, is laying strong emphasis on accusations towards the Soviet Union of imaginary treaty violations. How seriously are these accusations being taken in the United States?

[Gerasichev] I would say that they are being taken with great skepticism. For example, Senator Albert Gore, a Democrat from Tennessee, has stressed that the Soviet Union is scrupulously observing the numerous restrictions laid down by the treaty. Even such a recognized hawk as Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, was forced to admit that the Soviet Union is carrying out the replacement of obsolete types of armaments in keeping with the treaty's provisions.

[Surguchev] Have Americans become acquainted with the statement of the Soviet Government and what was said last Wednesday at the press conference organized by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs? In the statement and at the press conference, the attempts of the Washington administration to pass the buck were exposed in a well-argued fashion.

[Gerasichev] I have to say that wide circles of Americans are unfortunately not familiar with the Soviet Government's statement. Particularly smaller newspapers, those the ordinary American reads, try to avoid the publication of all Soviet statements. The press conference in Moscow is essentially being hushed up here in the United States.

[Surguchev] It is common knowledge that the United States, during the period in power of the present administration has been striving to push ahead with the arms race at an unprecedented rate. Agreements on limiting it were never in favor with President Reagan. But right now, specific factors have appeared that have prompted his government to free itself from the limits set by SALT II and the antimissile defense agreement. What can you say about this?

[Gerasichev] As a whole, it is understandable why they have threatened these agreements. If the first treaty restrains the appetite of the U.S. military machine in the sphere of such up-to-date types of strategic offensive armaments as MX missiles, Midgetman, the up-to-date long-range B-1B bombers with cruise missiles on board, then the second treaty patently prevents the Pentagon from implementing the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, and from moving the arms race into space. At the basis of the refusal to observe existing accords lies in the striving of Washington to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. In connection with this, I would like to cite what a NEW YORK TIMES observer, Flora Lewis, said. In the administration the upper hand is being held by those, Lewis says, who believe that in the absence of agreements, U.S. technological superiority and wealth will exceed Russian capabilities to such an extent that Moscow will come to a conclusion about its inability to compete with the United States. This is an illusion from many points of view, Flora Lewis notes.

[Surguchev] Yes, sensible Americans understand this. But the President and his entourage, judging by everything, want to remain prisoner to this illusion that is so sweet for them. Nonetheless, the reality is, and this was stressed in the statement of the Soviet Government, that the United States will not succeed in achieving military superiority at the expense of security of others. The USSR will take the necessary practical measures in order not to allow damage to be done to the military and strategic parity. The decision by Washington to bury the major agreements on the limiting of strategic aramaments has also disturbed U.S. allies in NATO also. As is known, not one of them at the recent NATO Council session in the Canadian town of Halifax, supported this extremely risky step by the White House.

FRG's Genscher Urges Compliance

LD062013 Moscow TASS in English 1959 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn June 6 TASS--FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher declared for the observance of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 Treaty in an interview to ARD television company today. No one can be interested in the opening of a new stage of the arms race, he said. When the FRG Government learnt of the intention of the U.S. Administration to stop observing the treaty, it expressed its interest in the continued observance of the provisions of the treaty.

'Slap in Face' for Allies

PM091209 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 6 Jun 86 p 5

[Vladislav Drobkov "Observer's Opinion"]

[Text] Condemnation and isolation. Those are two words to describe the reaction of most European countries to the U.S. Administration's SALT II decision.

Even the closest U.S. allies realize that Washington's reckless action is aimed at accelerating the arms race in a number of directions. Warnings about this, incidentally, have been issued not only by the U.S. alarmed partners by by sober-minded Americans: eminent scientists and specialists in the arms control sphere, leaders of antiwar movements and organizations, and even many inhabitants of Capitol Hill -- the legislators.

The unprecedented isolation of the Washington administration has been caused by the high-handed disdain that it has again showed for its allies' interests and opinions. As London, Bonn, Ottawa, and Rome are now stating with unconcealed offense, the United States has failed to heed the appeals of many Western governments that favored maintaining the limitations formulated in the 1972 SALT I and the 1979 SALT II agreements.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, Western Europe has perceived Washington's action as a "slap in the face." "The United States looks like a less than reliable ally," the London newspaper TODAY stated, recalling that several weeks ago the United States was pretending that it intended to continue to adhere to SALT II.

The present "slap in the face" to the allies is, alas, not the first. The United States crudely brushed aside the opinion of its remaining partners when planning and carrying out the bandit raid on Libya with the complicity of London. Literally the other day, this time in a deal with the FRG, Washington pushed through the NATO authorities the decision to produce binary chemical arms behind the backs of the West European people and in the face of protests from a number of NATO governments.

Encounting from its bloc allies condemnation of its actions that was without precedent for "Atlantic solidarity," the R. Reagan administration is now pretending that nothing special has happened. It is already voicing the hope that the allies will swallow this bitter pill too and come to terms with the new "slap in the face." Clearly, Washington is already accustomed to submissiveness and "flexibility" on the part of the allies. The question is how long the U.S. allies themselves will be prepared to put up with the unenviable role of subordinates whose opinion is only cited when it accords with the aspirations of the "senior partner."

'Divide' Between U.S., NATO Partners

LD082014 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program; presented by Spartak Beglov]

[Text] The personal fate of people, the interests of various sections of the working people -- be they workers of farmers -- are indissolubly bound with the fate of peace, disarmament, and international cooperation. Has Washington, in its relations with its junior partners, crossed that divide where the most important and vital national interests have turned out to be threatened? That is the question an increasing number of West Europeans are pondering, including the politicians in the upper echelons of power.

I refer to two provocative step taken by the U.S. Administration. The first is Washington's refusal, which I mentioned earlier, to fulfill the conditions of the 1972 SALT I agreement and the 1979 SALT II agreement that established ceilings for USSR and the U.S. strategic offensive weapons.

The second is how Washington thwarted the adoption of a program to expand contacts and exchanges between the Helsinki agreement participatory states at a conference in the Swiss capital of Bern. The U.S. representatives turned out to be on their own both at the NATO council session in the Canadian city of Halifax where Washington's attitude toward SALT II was discussed, and at the conference in Bern, where in essence the Americans had nothing else left to do except impose a veto on the final document of the meeting of representatives from 35 states. Using sports terminology: In the first case the score was 14-1, and in the second 34-1, against the United States. In vain the NATO foreign affairs ministers from Western Europe tried to dissuade their U.S. colleague, and through him the Washington administration as well, from encroaching on accords on which, in essence, the balance and stability of the present strategic situation are being maintained. If one is to call a spade a spade, the U.S. leadership is openly letting it be understood that from now on it believes it has the right to disregard any accord at any time when such an accord stands in the way of its pursuit of one new type of weapon or another -- in the way of another spiral in the arms race.

Canadian Foreign Minister Clark said that this is a profoundly alarming event. The FRG assessed the U.S. move as being fraught with potential disaster for the arms control process. The Americans wounded their British partner particularly strongly. After all, London has always laid claim to a special relationship with Washington. Quite recently, before the whole world, the Thatcher government took the risk of giving a demonstration of its boundless loyalty to the policy of the U.S. leadership when it allowed the use of British bases -- bases on British soil -- for the U.S. raid on Libya. Millions of Britons did not hide their indignation at this act of aiding and abetting the aggressor. The latest public opinion polls in Great Britain have shown such a fall in popularity of the Conservative government that if elections were held now the ruling party, in the opinion of experienced observers, would lose badly. Now it really is out of the frying pan into the fire; and this does not concern London alone. As the NEW YORK TIMES newspaper noted the other day, for two staunch Reagan supporters, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl, the U.S. action has been a slap in the face.

Of course, one should not go to the other extreme either. It would be an illusion to think that the leaders of the West European NATO countries have immediately begun to see clearly and have adopted positions of political realism that require a close interaction with the USSR and the other socialist countries on the issues of peace and disarmament. The point is simply that many of the bourgeois statesmen on this side of the Atlantic Ocean have had their instinct of political self-preservation come alive with full force. Their anxiety over their political future has increased as they have become conscious of the fact that while the present administration is on watch in Washington, the possibility of an agreement between East and West will increasingly come to naught. If the prospects for disarmament and cooperation with the socialist countries are tightly shut off, which is what the U.S. hawks are leading to, then the present West European governments could as a result completely lose the confidence of their countries. If it is true that the world is too small and fragile for a policy of confrontation and of an uncontrolled arms race, then this truth is doubly applicable to Europe.

Against the background of Washington's provocative course, the course taken by the USSR and its allies to pave the way for disarmament and to make this aim real and attainable is acquiring a special sense in the eyes of West Europeans. This explains the huge interest that is being shown in Europe and throughout the world in the friendly visit by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the Hungarian People's Republic.

U.S. Hawks On 'Eurowimps'

LD092136 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Vadim Muchkin commentary]

[Text] Last week there was an outcry throughout the world over Washington's announcement that it intends to scrap the very basis of the arms control process, the SALT II treaty with the Soviet Union. In Western Europe, according to media reports, President Reagan's announcement caused dismay even among America's closest allies. Here in the studio with me is Vadim Muchkin, who is watching West European reactions.

Virtually every American ally in Western Europe has appealed to Washington not to slam the door leading to progress in arms control, and all of them have expressed disappointment with the failure of the White House to consult the NATO allies properly before a firm decision was taken on the matter. But as far as I know these objections have been rejected by Washington officials. For one by Kenneth Adelman, the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He called this European complaint just a bum rap.

Yes, there seems to be no shortage of derisive terms employed by the Washington hawks against those who they call Eurowimps, but as far as the issue of proper consultation is concerned, Mr Adelman considers it to be sufficient simply to inform the allies of what he calls the tentative direction in which Washington is headed. The allies' appeal for compliance with SALT II, says Kenneth Adelman, was taken into account before President Reagan made his final decision. And that decision was to break out of the treaty, completely ignoring allied opposition to such a move.

Here we arrive at certain differences of opinion that underline the present rift in the Atlantic alliance. As THE GUARDIAN put it, there are strong, maybe now dominant, trends in the Republican hierarchy in the United States, who do not want or believe in arms control. They do not understand a world in which Europe wishes to live in peace and security with its continental neighbors. From where they sit in Texas or California, Europe is an effete agglomeration of appeasement. The proposed rupturing of SALT II is thus the most significant of developments. If it happens, warns THE GUARDIAN, then European-American relations will probably be changed for all time. The most immediate effect could lie in serious political difficulties for the ruling parties of a number of West European countries. That was the joint conclusion of British, French and West German correspondents speaking in a Cable News Network program.

The standing of the British prime minister, Mrs Thatcher, for example, could be seriously impaired because in the public eye she is closely associated with President Reagan's foreign policies. That's why there's every growing understanding, even in the ranks of the Conservative Party, that London should resolutely state its support for the SALT II treaty. If the former West German chancellor, Helmut Schmidt, was right in accusing West European governments of abdicating their role in world affairs, then very tough political questions will, in the words of THE GUARDIAN, be hammering at the electoral door every time a politician rises to his feet and nervously clears his throat.

Canadian Think Tank Refutes U.S. Charges

LD102216 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Excerpts] The Canadian Center for Arms Control has described as totally groundless Washington's claims that the Soviet Union has violated the Strategic Arms Limitation Treatry, SALT II. It said so in a special statement issued in Ottawa. We now bring you a commentary by Nikolay Borin.

This is a third influential military information center to confirm directly or indirectly that there is strategic parity between the United States and the Soviet Union and to refute attempts to blame Moscow for violations of SALT-II. The Center for Defense Information in Washington and the Institute of Strategic Studies based in London share that opinion of their Canadian counterpart. Experts at the London institute have stressed the fact that strategic balance between the two blocs had inclined in the West's favor in 1985.

However, President Reagan this week has put heavy pressure on Congress to make it approve a huge $320 billion military budget. President Reagan in his message to Congress said that any money taken from United States strategic programs would mark a victory for potential aggressors. Mr Reagan has obviously resorted to the old formula of John Dulles, one of the masterminds of the cold war who was American secretary of state in the fifties. Mr Dulles said that to make the country carry a heavy burden of arms spending it was necessary to create the impression that there's foreign threat to produce an atmosphere similar to that of wartime.

Intensive efforts to push the military budget through Congress have coincided with the White House announcement that it is going to make inroads into SALT II. This is not accidental, because it is the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT II

and the anti-ballistic missile treaty that have prevented an unrestricted race in strategic arms. After making inroads into the SALT II treaty, the United States Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger made it clear that Washington was not going to strictly comply with the ABM Treaty if that agreement were an obstacle in the way of the star wars program.

Naturally, Western Europe cannot but be concerned that the United States has turned a deaf ear to calls from its NATO allies for honoring arms control agreements. The interests of American munitions corporations which fear that the production of missiles and nuclear warheads may start declining, have been put before the interests of the political alliance. The United States military industrial corporations have for nearly 30 years lived on arming ground, naval and air nuclear forces.

The White House, by giving its munitions monopolies a free hand, has decided to lay mines under a common policy of NATO countries and under bilateral agreements with Moscow. In other words, down with any obstacles in the way of super profits for military industrial affairs. This is Washington's slogan today and it is dangerous. The Canadian Center for Arms Control says that policy is going to smash the delicate and vital structure of Arms Control which has been created over the past 15 years.

UK Labor Party Official Critical

PM111400 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 11 Jun 86 p 5

[Interview with Denzil Davies, Labour Party defense spokesman, by own correspondent A. Maslennikov under the "Our Interview" rubric: "No Time to Lose"]

[Text] President Reagan's intention to refuse to observe Salt II provisions is bound to arouse anger and disquiet among everyone interested in curbing the arms race, Labour shadow defense spokesman D. Davies stated in an interview given to PRAVDA's London correspondent A. Maslennikov. It shows that the White House boss has completely capitulated to pressure from his own administration's right wing, which has always opposed agreements on arms control.

The move, D. Davies warned, will inevitably have the most adverse effect on the international situation and the whole structure of East-West relations. It will have a particularly pernicious effect on the situation in Europe, where many people correctly regard the U.S. President's decision as a desire to gain superiority in the nuclear arms sphere.

Nor can we disregard, my interlocutor continued, the fact that Washington's decision was made, as has happened repeatedly in the past, without consultations with the other NATO members. This is a virtual repeat of the situation that arose at the time of Reagan's decision on the "star wars" program, when a most important step, one altering the whole strategic concept of the Western alliance, was made unilaterally by Washington and the allies were only informed about it after the fact. The decision on U.S. production of a new generation of chemical weapons was made in a similar situation. In all these cases we can observe the same thing: The U.S. Administration's desire to use its NATO allies as pawns in its global game and the NATO bloc itself as a kind of auxiliary instrument of American foreign policy.

All this is bound to cause us the deepest concern. Demands for the pursuit of a more independent policy are growing in Western Europe. We are convinced that the countries

of Western Europe could contribute to a relaxation of international tension. We have our own views and interest in world politics, which are different from those of the United States. Those interests are incompatible with concepts like "limited" nulcear wars, which are so named because they would like to conduct them only in Europe, and certainly not on U.S. territory itself. The West Europeans' interests demand an end to the militarist rhetoric that we constantly hear from the Reagan administration.

In short, Western Europe does not share the attitude to the Soviet Union characteristic of the present Washington administration. Our history, traditions, and our geography are different. We live on the same continent as the Soviet Union and not thousands of miles away like the United States.

Unfortunately, D. Davies continued, because of the character of the political parties that have come to power in a number of West European countries in recent years this difference of approach has not been as clearly marked as it should have been. Some of those parties, including the British Conservatives, follow Washington all too obediently since their leaders share to a great extent the cold war ideological concepts characteristic of the Reagan administration.

We proceed from the premise that this situation cannot go on forever. I personally am convinced that if the West European NATO members were not so cowed by Washington it would now be possible to achieve considerably greater progress in carrying out the Helsinki process, in the area of formulating a treaty banning chemical weapons, and in the sphere of "Eurostrategic" missiles. There is an opportunity to achieve progress at the talks on the reduction of armed forces in Europe, where in my view the Soviet Union's recent proposals provide a good basis for reaching agreement. However, priority must be given to the question of nuclear weapons, whose stockpiling presents the main threat.

We in the Labour Party, D. Davies continued, see no real reasons now preventing the conclusion of a treaty on a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests. Obstacles are being placed in the way of such an agreement by the Reagan administration, which wants to continue tests with the aim of creating new types of nuclear weapons, including those connected with the "star wars" program. A negative role is also being played in this affair by the Thatcher government, which has an interest in holding tests connected with the development of warheads for the new Trident missiles. The numerous arguments now put forward against a nuclear test ban are bogus.

It is the paradox of our time, D. Davies said at the end of our conversation, that a situation has arisen in the world where the threat of an all-consuming nuclear conflagration has never been as real and at the same time mankind has never been as close to averting it once and for all. The accident at the Chernobyl AES, and I would like to express our deepest sympathy for the victims and express admiration for the heroism of those who combated the aftereffects, confirmed once again that prevention is the only protection against nuclear war.

We in the Labour Party are convinced that there is no time to lose. The governments of the West European countries, including Britain, must take part in the discussion of those questions. That discussion does not promise to be easy. Differences and difficulties are inevitable. But there is no other way.

U.S. in 'Difficult' Position

LD122303 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1441 GMT 12 Jun 86

[From "The World Today" program; presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpt] U.S. President Reagan's announcement that Washington will no longer adhere to the provisions of SALT II remains an important subject attracting the attention of the world's press.

Many press commentators, both in Western Europe and -- which is especially significant -- in the United States, are saying that the Reagan government has made its biggest mistake. Indeed, the stormy reactions, both internationally and in the United States itself, show that by acting as it has, the Washington leadership has put itself in a very difficult political position. This reaction certainly seems to have taken both the President and his advisors completely by surprise; and clear signs of dismay are now evident in the U.S. capital. The arguments of the Washington leaders claiming that the Soviet Union is not observing the treaty have collapsed. Not only many organs of the press and authoritative political figures, but also the influential National Security Council, have recently published documentary data proving that the Soviet Union is fully observing all the provisions of SALT II.

In the U.S. capital, too, the President's statement has created a situation without precedent in the period in office of the Reagan government: Never before, in these years, has there been as serious a conflict betwwen the President and the Congress. In both houses of the supreme legislative body of the United States, resolutions have already been presented with the aim of forcing the President to change his position and continue to observe SALT II. The press reports that in the Congress, a bloc is being formed comprising members not only of the opposition Democratic Party, but also of the ruling Republican Party, to make the White House change its mind. The parliamentarians emphasize that if the President sticks to his guns, he will be refused allocations for the development of new weapons in violation of SALT II. One way and another, it is quite obvious that Washington has recently come to be dominated by extreme right-wing politicans, and they are the ones who have pushed the President into taking this highly dangerous step. The reactions to it, both in the United States and in other countries, show that a growing number of politicians in the West realize how dangerous this course is.

At a White House press conference today, President Reagan again declared, despite mounting protests in the United States and throughout the world, that his government intends to violate the provisions of SALT II. Demonstrating an obvious lack of coordination in the actions of leaders of the administration, and contrary to assertions that the United States is taking this step in retaliation for something that the Soviet Union has done, the U.S. President frankly admitted that he has always been against this treaty.

At the same press conference, Reagan announced the decision to begin building a new space shuttle to replace Challenger, which on 28 January, became the grave of seven U.S. astronauts. He justified his decision by the fact that many payloads destined to be put into orbit have piled up in the United States. The President kept silent about the circumstance that most of these payloads belong to the Pentagon.

House Committee Urges Compliance

LD122253 Moscow TASS in English 2241 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 13 TASS -- The House Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S. Congress has urged the Reagan administration to keep to the limits set by the strategic arms limitation agreements. By 29 votes against eleven the committee has voted for a resolution tabled by a large group of congressmen. The resolution says that the strategic arms limitation agreements meet the vital interests of the United States national security. The President must keep to the limits set by SALT agreements, as long as the Soviet Union acts the same, the resolution says.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1424

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET REPORTS, COMMENTS ON REAGAN SALT II POLICY

Speakes: Decision 'Final'

LD062246 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 6 June 86

[Text] A White House spokesman has said that President Reagan's decision to abandon the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, SALT II, is final. Mr Larry Speakes said the United States was going to exceed the limits established by the treaty by the end of the year. Mr Speakes admitted there was a serious congressional opposition to that plan. The majority of the members of the House of Representatives have put their signature to a letter in which they demand that the administration not denounce the treaty. A group of senators from both parties have spoken in favor of the treaty. However, Mr Speakes said that the President would influence Congress and would not alter his decision in any case.

White House Briefing

OW061321 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0200 GMT 6 Jun 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Viktor Konnov commentary]

[Text] A briefing on the SALT II issue took place at the White House. Here is our commentary on the briefing:

[Konnov] Hello, comrades. This briefing, conducted by State Department Deputy Spokesman Djerejian, is highly illuminating for an understanding of the U.S. leadership's position on the question of limiting strategic arms. First, it demonstrated the inconsistency of U.S. Administration statements about alleged instances of violations of SALT II by the Soviet side.

In answer to a direct question from an American correspondent -- why break that aspect of the agreement that the Russians clearly have not broken, the quantitative limits -- the deputy spokesman could find nothing better to say than that the structure of SALT II had become obsolete. When the correspondent asked whether it had not become obsolete because of the forced arms buildup and accelerated arms modernization by the United States, the briefing officer repeated: We are forced to exceed the framework of SALT II in order to unfold a new weapons system, so we can achieve our modernization program.

Well, it really is a vicious circle. First, the U.S. Adminstration is forced to exceed the framework of the treaty, and the, naturally declares it to be obsolete.

The appetite of the U.S. military complex is growing from day to day. A quote at the White House briefing by Defense Secretary Weinberger saying that SALT II is being canceled in order to include the star wars system in the U.S. arsenal is highly symptomatic. Although the briefing officer, the State Department deputy spokesman, tried to call this a free interpretation of Weinberger's remark, here, so to speak, is where the crux of the matter lies. To the military mind, which has been agitated by the scope and prospects of the star wars program, it is very hard to remain in the framework of any agreement, including SALT II. The White House briefing showed that the old thinking still prevails in the nuclear age.

U.S. Claims Rebutted

LD071100 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] President Reagan's intention to abandon SALT II and SALT II means that the United States is ready to denounce its commitments taken under these two major international legal documents. Commenting on the White House decision, Lev Semeyko, a leading expert on arms control and disarmament, makes the following points:

Everything that has been attained and has become the foundation of more or less normal relations between our two countries, no matter how tense, is now questioned. These are first of all SALT I and SALT II and also the ABM agreement. The United States scraps all these documents. President Reagan has already made it clear that as of the end of this year the American side will no longer consider the constraints laid upon it by SALT II as binding. So it seems that the two countries will have a little left to their credit as far as the development of relations between them is concerned.

Washington claims that its negative stand on the SALT II treaty is motivated by the fact that the Soviet Union fails to abide by its provisions, violating them time and again. This is actually what the United States is doing. The arms buildup ceilings set by the treaty have long been tying America's hands. The Soviet Union has warned on many occasions that the United States is seeking to undermine the existing agreements.

As for the Soviet position on them, it has been made known repeatedly to the American side. The Soviet side has shown many times officially that the allegations made by the United States were not just. For example, the United States claims that the SS-25 missile is a new kind of intercontinental ballistic missile banned by SALT II. In reality, it is a modernization of the RS-12 intercontinental ballistic missile allowed by the treaty. Experts are aware of this. But the United States seeks to derive benefit by slandering the Soviet Union. In the meantime, it has already developed a new kind of the MX class and is now in the process of developing a second, the Midgetman class, all in defiance of SALT II. To justify this the United States attempts to lay the blame at the Soviet Union's door. This is only one example illustrating the American approach. Seeking to whitewash his political reputation, President Reagan has adopted the following stand: The United States refuses to observe SALT II because the Soviet Union allegedly continues violating it. Nevertheless, it will be working towards a parity in the strategic nuclear systems even without the treaty.

The Soviet Union by now knows what sort of parity this will be. The President promises not to outrun the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear delivery systems and warheads in ICBM's and SLBM's. This means that there will be a parity in only one group of these strategic forces rather than in the strategic forces as a whole. No count is made of the number of bombers and air-based cruise missiles in which the United States

surpasses the Soviet Union three times. The United States makes no mention of the sea-based cruise missiles of which it plans to have several thousand. Nor does the United States make any mention of the medium-range missiles stationed in Europe and capable of reaching the Soviet Union's territory.

By contrast, Soviet missiles in Europe pose no threat to American territory. It is obvious, therefore, that the Soviet Union is in no position to accept the proposal that are bound to make it vulnerable. Washington knows this only too well. However, it makes believe that it has come up with peace proposals and the Soviet Union, don't you see, refuses to heed them. This is not quite honest and is also dangerous. If the United States decides to give up SALT II and escalate further the weapons build-up, the Soviet Union will take counter steps.

The danger to peace will increase and that means it will increase for the United States, too. The Soviet Union called on the American Administration many times urging it to refrain from spurring on the round of the arms race. One may recall at this point that the United States was the first to develop multiple warheads for intercontinental ballistic missiles. To secure its defnese the Soviet Union developed similar systems. Now the United States regards this as one of the main factors threatening its territory. But who was initiator of the development of multiple warheads, who was the first to develop nuclear submarines with SLBM's, heavy bombers or cruise missiles? The United States launched every new round of the nuclear arms race with the hope of winning military superiority over the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union took countermeasures each time, with the danger to the United States invariably increasing.

Effect on Summit Plans

LD082122 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 1730 GMT 8 Jun 86

[Interview with Viktor Afanasayev, chief editor of the Soviet daily PRAVDA, by unidentified correspondent in Prague on 8 June; questions and answers in Russian with superimposed Czech translation]

[Text] [Correspondent] Comrade Afanasayev, as you arrive in Prague the world press has been writing about the Reagan administration's refusal to observe SALT II. What is your view of this decision? What sort of influence will it have on Soviet-U.S. relations and on the envisaged summit meeting between the USSR and the United States?

[Afanasayev] I will begin my reply to this question from the opposite end. Of course, Reagan's decision to equip B-52 bombers with new missiles in numbers that will exceed the limit agreed in SALT II starting this fall does not assist the forthcoming summit meeting. We do not exclude the possibility of this meeting but it must not be an empty and futile meeting.

This meeting must resolve at least two or three -- perhaps even only one important issue -- concerning arms control, and, naturally, there has to be an appropriate political climate. This atmosphere is not being created by decisions such as the refusal to observe SALT II.

In effect, two basic agreements exist: the treaty forbidding the development of offensive weapons in space and SALT II. Although the latter treaty has not been ratified -- the blame for which lies with the U.S. side -- despite this, it has been observed out of goodwill for a number of years. The treaty sets the maximum number of nuclear weapons carriers -- 1,320 units -- and this maximum has been maintained. Thus, for instance we, whenever we have included any new missile in our armory or modernized an obsolete one or abandoned an old submarine equipped with nuclear carriers, we have strictly observed this maximum. And this naturally acted as a brake on the arms race. Today, when Reagan has decided to renounce this limitation we are standing at the outset of a new, totally uncontrollable arms spiral, since there are no treaties and no obligations that can act as a brake to this race.

Arms Race 'Pedal to Floor'

PM100846 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 8 Jun 86 p 4

[Vladimir Bolshakov "International Review"]

[Excerpts] Realism or Obsession?

In recent days the international public has been watching with alarm a kind of "hawks' contest" in the Washington leadership. The contest consisted, in particular, in seeing who could be most scathing about the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II). The Pentagon chief called it "obsolete," and this was followed by epithets such as "flawed," "dead," and even "encouraging, not limiting the arms race." Let us leave this abuse on the conscience of those who resort to it for the purpose of camouflaging their hostility toward a treaty system which curbs the arms race.

Unfortunately, the American "hawks" did everything possible to prevent the SALT II treaty being ratified by the U.S. Congress. Next they wrecked the SALT talks process. And then, a few days ago, the White House adopted a decision to renounce the SALT I and SALT II treaties.

Why has the United States now decided to unilaterally denounce these legal treaty documents? The "fact book" recently disseminated by the White House for the purpose of justifying the growth in the U.S. military budget for fiscal 1987 to $320 billion set forth an extensive program for the "modernization of strategic forces." It is essentially a program for intensifying the arms race by producing a new Stealth-type "invisible aircraft," Trident-2 submarines, D-5 and MX missiles, "small mobile ICBM's," and "star wars."

The SALT II framework has become too cramped for the Pentagon. This is precisely why the United States has now decided to destroy the treaty basis created in the arms limitation sphere as a result of the treaties and agreements reached in the seventies. Washington has preferred, as people there now say, to "change gear," that is, to renounce all the earlier adopted commitments, push the gas pedal to the floor in the arms race vehicle, and try to forge ahead and upset Soviet-U.S. military parity, which has hitherto served as the basis strategic stability in the world.

These calculations are just as absurd as the explanations cited by Washington in justification of the decision to renounce SALT I and II. None other than K. Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, went so far as to say that the purpose

of this step by the U.S. Administration is to "make the Russians observe the provisions of the arms control agreements." The White House's chief "disarmer" contrived to name among these even the "limited nuclear weapon test ban treaty" and the "treaty limiting underground nuclear weapon tests"! And this at a time when the USSR has been continuing for approximately a year to observe unilaterally its moratorium on all nuclear explosions and has been urging the United States to do the same, while the latter responds to this by demonstratively carrying out explosion after explosion on the Nevada nuclear test site! How can you help recalling here the boy in Andersen's fairy tale who exclaimed: "The emperor has no clothes!"

Of course, Washington is now trying to cover up its militarist private parts with propaganda fig leaves. But this is being done so clumsily that even the orthodox journalists who are allowed to attend confidential White House briefings openly doubt the fabrications being disseminated by the Pentagon about the Soviet Union's "violations" of signed treaties.

Washington is now trying to demonstrate that its refusal to observe the SALT II treaty is virtually a step forward in the "arms control sphere." The White House has even advanced some "formula of genuine mutual restraint in the absence of SALT II." In accordance with this, the USSR is to take Washington at its word and be satisfied with that. And it will be up to Washington to decide whether to reduce or increase the number of warheads and delivery vehicles. People on the other side of the ocean are now making it clear that everything will "depend on the Russians' behavior," the "marks" for which, it is clear, will be given on the other side of the ocean. But the true essence of this "formula" is different.

Senator J. Biden recently declared that the abandonment of SALT II is "a dangerous step." And the White House has taken it because "the leadership of U.S. policy in the arms control sphere has fallen into the hands of a small political clique of extreme right-wing radicals who have been trying for many years to totally destroy the entire arms control structure." J. Biden has submitted to the Senate a bill prohibiting the allocation of funds to the Pentagon for strategic arms in excess of the limits set by the SALT II treaty. A similar draft has been submitted to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Europe's Alarms

British Prime Minister M. Thatcher, Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney, and other NATO leaders have dissociated themselves in one form or another from the U.S. position. FRG Foreign Minister Genscher declared: "We believe that until there is something better, SALT II represents in any case a barrier in the way of a new twist to the arms race spiral."

If you take into account the fact that this is not the first time the mechanism of Atlantic solidarity has been on the skids (recall Western Europe's reaction to the recent U.S. banditlike action against Libya), it is worth pondering why even those who have usually followed in the wake of Washington's foreign policy are so alarmed at its behavior. Let us take the approach of West European countries and the United States to today's chief problem -- the problem of security in our nuclear missile age. The Pentagon allocates to Western Europe the role of a "theater of military operations," a kind of bridgehead for unleashing nuclear aggression against the socialist countries. Can West Europeans have an objective interest in this, even if they are U.S. allies? No, they cannot. They understand that if the United States removes the restrictions

provided for by the SALT II treaty, more and more new American forward-based nuclear missile means -- in point of fact, strategic first-strike weapons -- will appear on West European soil and in their sea space and airspace. They understand that the USSR will take the necessary practical measures to prevent the undermining of military-strategic parity.

Even those people in West European NATO countries who still campaign for the "strategy of deterrence" prefer it to be implemented at a far lower level of nuclear missile confrontation. People in the United States also appear to verbally advocate the same thing. In fact, there is no way they will abandon their illusions that a particular achievement of military technology will enable them to "win a nuclear war" or "bring the Russians to their knees" without even waging one. Both illusions are equally fantastic. But fantasy is being elevated to the rank of state policy, and realistically-minded politicians must take this into account.

Of course, the Soviet Union knows how to react properly to the planned U.S. violations of the SALT II treaty. But this is not our choice. The choice proposed by the USSR is genuine realism as a counterbalance to militarist obsession. Many people recognize the sensible nature of the Soviet alternative. We will cite just the authoritative opinion of T. Hoopes, former U.S. under secretary for the Air Force.

The EAST-WEST OUTLOOK bulletin recently carried his article, which states, in particular:

"M.S. Gorbachev's arms control proposals are convincing and reflect the profound conviction that the superpowers and the whole world are now faced with a new dilemma: Either they immediately cease production of an ever increasing number of increasingly accurate weapons of mass destruction and admit that they are all confronted with the common problem of survival, or the arms race will inevitably spread into space and create still greater uncertainty and the danger of war for all the sides concerned.

"It is worthy of profound regret," T. Hoopes writes, "that by rejecting the proposal to subscribe to the unilateral Soviet moratorium Washington clearly demonstrated its determination not to impose any restructions in its production of new and increasingly sophisticated arms, both offensive and defensive, on earth and in space."

They now intend to "legitimize" all this through Washington's abandonment of the SALT I and SALT II treaties.

Commenting on the White House decision, the West European press also writes with alarm about the U.S. departure from the accords reached at the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. It is known that there both sides confirmed their countries' determination not to seek military superiority and to proceed from the premise that it is impossible to win a nuclear war. It seems that, in order more fully to satisfy the American ultra-right and the military-industrial complex, the White House has now decided to tear up the Geneva accords along with the SALT II treaty. The recent references by certain high-ranking Washington figures to "loyalty to the Geneva spirit" sound cynical, to say the least, in the context of that treaty's "funeral."

In Europe, where every inch of ground has been drenched with the blood of the victims of the numerous wars that have marked our continent's history, many people these days are pondering very alarming historical parallels. Did the preparations for World War II not begin with the tearing up of arms limitation treaties and agreements?

Soap Bubble

Everyone knows the effect of a needle touching a soap bubble. The smart, iridiscent, ethereal creation bursts. Something similar also happened to the American campaign "in defense of human rights" In Bern, at the all-European conference of experts on contacts among people, whose results are being commented on to this day.

Something else is also interesting here -- the U.S. veto on the Bern final document coincided to the very day with Washington's "veto" on the SALT II treaty. W. Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, recently directly accused the Washington administration of disregarding its European allies, and in this connection he cited both the example of the Bern conference and the abandonment of SALT II.

The coincidence both in time and in the manner of action was not accidental. They are both manifestations of the general hegemonistic, great-power chauvinistic line of the ruling military-industrial complex in the United States, which is crazy about world domination and intends to dictate its will to all mankind.

News Conference at UN

LD112216 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] New York June 11 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Baybakov reporting:

The permanent Misssion of the U.S.S.R. at the United Nations held a press conference today to attract attention to the virtual refusal of the United States to comply in the future with the 1972 and 1979 Soviet-U.S. strategic offensive arms limitation treaties.

President Reagan's May 27, 1986 speech shows that the United States unilaterally renounces the obligations under the existing agreements as they begin to contradict the realization of new U.S. armament programs, said Vladimir Shustov, deputy permanent representatives of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations. This means that the U.S. Administration is prepared to jeopardise the security of all nations and makes a deliberate attempt to scale up the arms race further. The case in point is an overt effort to achieve military advantages and upset the strategic military parity existing between the U.S.S.R. and the United States, he said.

The American side alleges that the United States showed restraint in the military sphere for as long as the strategic offensive arms limitation agreements have been in force, and that it is pressing for new, more effective, nuclear arms limitation agreements, the Soviet representative said. However, against the backdrop of the well-known major Soviet initiatives in the arms limitation field the United States is doing nothing to achieve the jointly announced aim of terminating the arms race on earth and preventing it in space. Moreover, we witness the adoption of ever new U.S. nuclear arms buildup programs, preparation for the production of a new barbarous mass annihilation weapon -- binary chemical weapons -- and plans for projecting the arms race to space. To this date calls for joining in the moratorium on nuclear explosions announced by the Soviet Union last August have been ignored. Vladimir Shustov emphasized that the Soviet Union would not be watching indifferently how the United States was breaking down the existing strategic offensive arms limitation agreements. As soon as the United States goes beyond the established limits on armaments or breaches in some other way the basic provisions of those

treaties which both sides have observed to date, the Soviet Union will consider itself free from the existing commitments.

It will take all the necessary practical measures to prevent the military parity from being upset, the Soviet representative emphasized.

Adelman Statement Scored

FM120844 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Jun 86 p 9

["Competent Person's Opinion" by Prof M. Milshteyn: "About the 'Formula To Replace SALT II'" -- first three paragraphs are LITERATURNAYA GAZETA introduction]

[Text] K. Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, recently made a statement in an attempt to justify the U.S. President's decision to abandon compliance with the provisions of SALT II.

"The United States has offered to the USSR a formula to replace SALT II," K. Adelman said in particular. "No talks will be required to ensure that the new verification [kontrol] measures come in force... We will adjust [korrektirovat] our forces not according to a seriously flawed... unratified and broken treaty, but according to the Soviet threat."

We asked a specialist on disarmament questions for his opinion on this statement. Here is what Prof M. Milshteyn said:

The purpose of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is to elaborate and coordinae U.S. policy at the arms limitation talks. It was set up back in 1961 under a special arms control law passed by the U.S. Congress. It was no accident that on many occasions in the past, directors of this agency headed the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. This is what happened in the early seventies, for example, when G. Smith headed the U.S. delegation, and it also happened under the Carter administration when P. Warnke was simultaneously head of the delegation and leader of the agency in question. The agency's representatives not only took part in the talks but also strove to a greater or lesser extent to reach specific mutually acceptable accords at them.

The agency's position and role changed when the Reagan administration came to power. Its main efforts were concentrated on discrediting agreements and treaties on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons, primarily the SALT II agreement. For this purpose the agency made considerable efforts to select biased and farfetched facts of alleged violations of this treaty by the Soviet Union. People known as opponents of agreements with the Soviet Union started heading the agency. K. Adelman was appointed to this position after playing a far from insignificant role in the making of the U.S. President's decision to abandon compliance with the provisions of the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I) and the treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT II).

It is well known that President Reagan's 27 May statement aroused a sharply negative reaction both inside the country and beyond its borders. In response, the U.S. Administration launched a broad propaganda campaign to substantiate the advisability of its decision. A certain position in the campaign has also been assigned to the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

K. Adelman's statement consists of vague expressions and is aimed at those who have no knowledge of the history of the talks and are insufficiently familiar with the essence and importance of the agreements that were concluded. He speaks about some kind of U.S. proposal to institute "a formula to replace SALT II." Moreover, the main point in his view is the reduction of the warheads that "cause damage," not those whose limitation is envisaged by SALT II. As if there were nuclear warheads that bring benefits. It is, furthermore, still not clear: Why should this require the abandonment of concluded agreements? Nor is it clear why all these "attractive" proposals cannot be discussed at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. And why the SALT II "violations" of which the statement speaks cannot be discussed and cleared up to mutual satisfaction using the machinery already existing in Geneva? The point still is that the concluded agreements impose serious mutual limitations on new military programs, hinder and restrict the implementation of plans by the United States to attain military superiority over the Soviet Union, enshrine the principle of equality and equal security, and ensure movement toward further arms reduction. This simply does not suit the incumbent U.S. Administration, which is interested in undermining the military-strategic parity to its own advantage.

Reagan 11 June Press Conference

LD120624 Moscow TASS in English 0620 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Washington June 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Ignatyev reports:

President Ronald Reagan confirmed at a press conference here on Wednesday that the U.S. Administration was not going furthermore to comply with the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT-1) and the treaty on the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (SALT-2). He said he "was always hostile to that particular treaty" and that it "was really nothing but the legitimizing of an arms race." The White House chief again tried to justify that unilateral denunciation of major U.S. commitments under international treaties by allegations of Soviet "violations" and by the fact that the treaty had never been ratified by the Senate.

The extreme worry caused all over the world by the arrogant intention of the administration to violate the SALT accords was reflected in numerous questions put to the President. As one journalist said, the White House's decision to tear up the SALT-2 treaty is a step towards creating "a more dangerous world." President Reagan also called for building another reusable space ship to replace the Challenger, which had exploded on January 28. He noted that there was a backlog of space cargo that was supposed to be up there. It is common knowledge that most of that cargo belongs to the Pentagon, which is insisting on an early resumption of the flights of reusable space ships.

White House Pronounces SALT II 'Dead'

LD130009 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Reports from Washington say the White House has pronounced the SALT II treaty to be dead. White House spokesman Larry Speakes told journalists the treaty was non-existent for the United States Administration. He said further moves concerning armaments would be taken by the administration with no regard for the limits stipulated by the Soviet-American SALT II agreement.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1424

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR'S BOVIN VIEWS U.S. RATIONALE FOR RENOUNCING SALT II

PM121429 Moscow IZVESTIYA (Morning Edition) in Russian 11 Jun 86 p 5

[A. Bovin article under the rubric "Political Observer's Opinion": "Have the Lunatics Won?.."]

[Text] I borrowed the words in the headline from Paul Warnke, one of the leading U.S. experts on problems of disarmament. Commenting on the President's decision to no longer observe SALT II he said: "Without any doubt, the civilian officials who have entered the Pentagon under the Reagan administration have never been supporters of arms control. In my view, that is a lunatic policy, and at this stage, the lunatics have won..."

We will return to this eloquent assessment later, but for the moment let us examine the factual aspect of the matter. SALT II set a ceiling of 1,320 units of ballistic missiles with MIRVed warheads and heavy bombers equipped with cruise missiles with a range in excess of 600 km. Within this ceiling it was permitted to have no more than 1,200 land-based and sea-launched ballistic missiles (ICBM's and SLBM's) with MIRVed warheads, of which no more than 820 were to be ICBM's.

By May this year the following situation had developed in America: The overall number of ICBM's and SLBM's with MIRVed warheads totaled 1,198 units. Consequently, the beginning of the sea trials of the new "Trident" class submarine that can be equipped with 24 missiles meant that the ceiling would be exceeded by 22 units. In order to remain within the limits imposed by SALT II, the administration had the choice of dismantling either 22 of the land-based Minuteman-3 missiles, or two old "Poseidon" submarines each of which has 16 launchers. The second option, as is not difficult to figure out, gives Americans a "reserve" of 10 units.

After much hesitation and squabbling it was announced in Washington on 27 May that the second option had been chosen. But at the same time it was emphasized that the reason for dismantling the submarines was not a desire to remain within the SALT II limits, but was furnished by purely military-economic considerations: The submarines had reached the end of their useful life and a capital overhaul would be too costly. On the subject of the treaty it was stated that by the end of the year when 131st strategic B-52 bomber is equipped with cruise missiles, the limit set by the treaty would be exceeded by the United States. (With 1,190 ballistic missiles with MIRVed warheads installed on land and on submarines, the Americans can deploy no more than 130 aircraft equipped with cruise missiles if they are to remain within the 1,320 limit. One more would already be a violation). It was emphasized that the United States would not feel bound by the treaty in the future either.

Giving the reasons for his decision, the U.S. President pleaded that "the Russians" have been systematically violating their obligations for a long time. Those very "Russians" have developed [sozdali] two new types of ICBM's although under the treaty they are only entitled to one. They encrypt telemetric information during missile tests. They are also building a radar station near Krasnoyarsk whose specifications and purpose are at variance with the ABM Treaty. The President hinted vaguely that if the USSR takes "constructive steps" to change the situation, the United States "will take this into account."

Soviet spokesmen tried to explain the true state of affairs to the Americans many times. Most recently it was S.F. Akhromeyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. I will cite his arguments. First, the missile to which the Americans refer as SS-25 is not a new type of an ICBM. It is a modification of the RS-12 missile that is permitted under the treaty. Second, we do not encrypt telemetry which has a bearing on the verification of the treaty (the number and weight of warheads, the missile's launch- and throw-weight, and so forth). If the Americans are worried about something, we have asked them to tell us what this "something" is, that is to say, to tell us what other information, in their view, must not be encrypted. They remain silent. And third, the Krasnoyarsk radar station is not intended for ABM defense and it will be possible to establish this with certainity when the station starts radiating [nachnet rabotat na izlucheniye].

All this is, doubtless, known in Washington. But it suits Washington to force the theme of "violations" because otherwise it would find it difficult to justify its own conduct, to find enough scope for juggling with the quantity and quality of strategic arms. Consequently the President's appeal "to change the situation" has been addressed to the wrong quarters. It is no accident that L. Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee described the claims against the Soviet Union as "utter nonsense."

Apparently aware that the argument about violations is clearly inadequate, the administration has mobilized everything it could think of. It is not just, they tell us, that the term of SALT II has expired, the treaty, after all, was never ratified by the U.S. Senate and therefore it never had any legal force. All this is true. But in this case prime importance attaches to political rather than legal considerations, to the expression of the will and the desire of both sides not to further complicate an already complicated situation.

In legal terms nothing has changed, what has changed is U.S. policy. That is the whole point.

Another of Washington's arguments is that the very concept of SALT I and SALT II is becoming increasingly obsolete since the limits they impose relate to launchers and strategic delivery vehicles rather than warheads. True, time is merciless and therefore everything becomes obsolete. A SALT III agreement would, doubtless, place greater emphasis on warheads. However, while no such treaty exists, it is nonetheless preferable to retain the limits on the quantity of strategic delivery vehicles. Furthermore, SALT II not only limits the number of launchers, it also contains certain limits in respect of the number of warheads.

And finally, Washington tells us the following. I cite the U.S. President: "The United States will not deploy more strategic nuclear delivery systems than the Soviet Union. Apart from that, the United States will not deploy more ballistic missile warhead than

the Soviet Union. We state this categorically." The ruse here is that the President is referring to ballistic missile warheads only. The strategic bombers and cruise missiles with which they are equipped plus the sea-launched cruise missiles are not included in this categorical statement.

When comparing the arguments of the U.S. Administration with Washington's actual policy it is impossible not to arrive at the conclusion that the formula proposed by the White House of "genuine mutual restraint in the absence of SALT" (this is how K. Adelman elegantly put it) is hypocritical and vacuous. So what is the real content of the White House policy? The U.S. newspaper THE BOSTON GLOBE describes the administration's intentions in the following manner: The concept of acceptable arms control pursued by the Reagan administration aims at achieving an agreement that demands the Russian disarm but would in no way hamper the expansion of the U.S. arsenal and especially the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of such technical innovations as new space means, cruise missiles, first-strike ballistic missiles, and so forth." And further: "The unilateral arms control the administration is seeking, of course, a stupid aim." The Soviet government... "is not likely to wait obediently and allow the United States to restore at least some measure of the superiority it commanded 30 years ago. Realists understand that arms control is a two-way street. However, a special breed of civilian 'cowboys' is prevalent in the Reagan administration according to whose calculations...it is possible to mobilize the U.S. lawmakers and taxpayers by means of raising a hue and cry about 'violations' and resorting to other standard methods of anti-Sovietism to support endless military spending." This is really so.

The policy of Washington "cowboys", those who -- as Paul Warnke put it -- "have won," alarms many Americans. Opposition to the President has intensified in Congress. R. Reagan's refusal to continue to observe SALT II will be assessed by history "as his most serious mistake," Senator A. Gore has said. Senator E. Kennedy described the President's decision as "the triumph of ideology over common sense." Senator J. Chafee declared that the abrogation of SALT II threatens "to put a definitive and to the arms control process" in which the USSR and the United States are involved. "one would like the adminstration to reconsider," Senator R. Stafford remarked. Member of the House (N. Diyes) and Senator J. Biden have introduced bills that ban the appropriation and expenditure of means for the deployment and utilization of strategic arms that exceed the framework of the Soviet-American agreements.

There is dissatisfaction among the U.S. allies. At the NATO Council session in Halifax (Canada), Washington's decision gave rise to all but the stormiest debates in NATO's history. U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz did all he could, but he was unable to change his colleagues' mind. "This is a profoundly disturbing event and we were hoping it would not happen," J. Clark, Canada's external affairs secretary said. On the other hand, H.D. Genscher, the FRG foreign minister concluded optimistically that the existence of various points of view was a sign of "the alliance's internal strength, rather than its weakness."

This is reassuring, of course. If the ability of the United States to act against the wishes of its allies is to be regarded as NATO's strength, then without any doubt the Atlantic alliance is strengthening with every passing year.

Summing up the resulting situation, WASHINGTON POST observer D. Broder writes: "It is difficult to see anything positive resulting from President Reagan's announcement that the United States will no longer consider itself bound by the limitations imposed by SALT II ... this decision will open the floodgates of the arms race at a time when

Congress and the U.S. public are beginning to show signs of tiredness with its pace. As for the relations with the U.S. allies, it represents a real loss. And, most likely, it will also mean a political loss for the Republicans in their own country." The fact that a substantial section of the Republicans in Congress is by no means applauding the President means an intensification of the political differentiation within the Republican Party.

So who is rejoicing? The U.S. extremists, the opponents of arms limitation, those who are dreaming of a world transformed in the image of "great America." A few years ago, suspecting their leader of making concessions to the liberals, these people were clamoring: "Let Reagan be Reagan!" This is why they are rejoicing: "Now at last, Reagan is being Reagan, and U.S. policy has gained immeasurably." Another paradox of our paradoxical times is that probably nobody can do greater damage to the United States than the "patriots" who are insistently calling for a buildup of U.S. strength. This is because to every action there is an equal and opposite reaction, because by increasing the threat to others, the Americans are weakening rather than strengthening U.S. security. "As soon as the United States exceeds the set arms limits or in any other way violates the other main provisions of the aforementioned agreements that have been observed by the sides up to now, the Soviet Union will consider itself no longer by the corresponding obligations under the 1972 Interim Agreement and the SALT II Agreement and will adopt the necessary practical measures to prevent the military-strategic parity from being underminded," the Soviet Government statement says.

We do not want to embark on this path, we would like to hope that in the final analysis the "lunatics" will not triumph over the common sense which is characteristic of the Americans.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1424

SALT/START ISSUES

REPORTAGE ON MOSCOW 4 JUNE PRESS CONFERENCE ON SALT II

TV Broadcast

LD042027 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1845 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on questions relating to strategic armaments with Marshall of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, first deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff; Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs; and Vladimir Komeyko, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Department; in Moscow on 4 June--recorded; video shows three participants seated around a conference table]

[Text] [Bessmertnykh] A few days ago the U.S. Administration undertook an action aimed at whipping up the arms race. President Reagan announced the United States' refusal to observe in the future the 1972 interim agreement on certain measures with respect to the limitation of strategic offensive arms and the 1979 Treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms.

An attempt has essentially been made to wreck the military parity between the USSR and the United States, which is the basis for strategic stability in the world, and to remove the existing material restrictions on the arms race.

U.S. representatives, including the President, try to justify the decision to drop the interim agreement and the SALT II treaty by citing some kind of Soviet violations of these documents. They cite the appearance in the USSR of an alleged second new type of ICBM--the SS-25--and in this context, the construction of a radar station in Krasnoyarsk is also mentioned--although let us note in passing that this radar station has nothing to do with the SALT II treaty.

There is no substantial foundation for any of these claims. The Soviet side has demonstrated more than once on the basis of concrete data that the United States is deliberately distorting the picture and is diverting attention from its own violations of treaties and agreements.

As the Soviet Government statement says, the United States will not manage to acquire military advantages for itself at the expense of others' security. The Soviet Union will take the necessary practical steps to prevent strategic military parity from being undermined. And the American side should have no illusions on this score.

[Lomeyko] We will now take questions and answers. There is a written question for Marshal Akhromeyev. Second German Television, FRG, (? Joachim Holtz). In what field of armaments has the USSR deployed more than the permitted number of launchers or warheads? Or have the American politicians told lies?

[Akhromeyev] The Soviet Union scrupulously and highly conscientiously fulfills all agreements on arms limitation which it has signed, whether they are with the United States on a bilateral basis, or whether they are multilateral ones with other states too. All requirements of the interim Salt I agreement and the SALT II treaty are fulfilled equally punctiliously. There are two accusations levied against the Soviet Union by the American Administration; the first being that the Soviet Union has deployed [razvertyvat] a second modern missile, whereas according to the SALT II treaty each side can deploy only one new modern missile; and the second accusation being that the Soviet Union encrypts the telemetry during launches of missiles and thereby also violates the SALT II treaty. Both the first assertion and the second assertion are ill-intentioned and deliberate falsehoods that have been put forward primarily to slander us as a socialist country and secondly to create grounds for abrogating these major agreements on arms limitation.

[Unidentified Czech journalist, in Russian] Czechoslovakian Telegraph Agency. Specific measures might the USSR take if the United States, having renounced the provisional SALT II agreement and the SALT II treaty, exceeds the prescribed level of strategic offensive armaments?

[Akhromeyev] I think the Soviet Union will have at its disposal sufficiently effective measures that it can take if the United States, in violation of the provisional agreement and SALT II treaty, begins deployment of its strategic armaments, such as, for instance, increasing the number of warheads on the intercontinental ballistic missiles. Other measures might also be taken.

[Unidentified Soviet journalist] Mention has been made here of the radar station that is being built by the Soviet Union in the vicinity of Krasnoyarsk. Well, we know that the United States is sitting a large radar station in Greenland, and intends to do the same in Britain. Could you perhaps comment on this?

[Besmertnykh] As regards the question of the Krasnoyarsk radar station, we have repeatedly, with the facts in our hands, shown both the world and the United States--in part through the channels available to us--not only diplomatic channels--that this station, which is really still at the stage of construction, is not designed to fulfill any functions forbidden by the ABM treaty. As you know, this is a station for tracking space objects, both Soviet and American, and therefore it has nothing to do with the ABM treaty. As for the American radar stations, these are powerful stations, one of which is being built at Thule in Greenland, and they're planning to build another in Britain, at the hamlet of fylingdales. These stations do, indeed, represent a violation of the ABM treaty. That is because the American side itself admits that in this case both of these stations are stations to give warning of ballistic missile attack. According to the ABM treaty, precisely such stations with these functions must be sited on the periphery of national territory. It

is perfectly obvious that neither Greenland nor Britain is the periphery, let alone the national territory, of the United States. Thus, this is a serious infringement of that fundamental document.

[Unidentified Polish journalist, in Russian] The Polish Interpress Agency, the Soviet side says that the deployment of American medium-range Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe is contrary to the SALT II treaty; the U.S. denies this. What are the facts?

[Bessmertnykh] Here, the United States is trying to deny the obvious. The American ballistic missiles, Pershing II and the cruise missiles, which are being deployed in Europe, by virtue of their siting and their location, already reach the territory of the Soviet Union. And therefore, they become a substantial addition to the strategic potential of the United States. By having deployed and by continuing to deploy these missiles, the American side is thereby committing a serious breach of one of the fundamental provisions of the SALT II treaty.

[Bessmertnykh, continued] This provision is distinctly laid out in the text of the treaty itself--namely, the principle that the sides will act on the basis of recognition of the rule of equality and equal security.

When the treaty was being drawn up, and it is well known that this took many years, the sides reached the conclusion that any actions that would alter the strategic balance and upset equality would be prohibited in accordance with the provisions on not circumventing the treaty. A special Article 12 was included in the treaty for this purpose on noncircumvention. If this provision did not exist, there would not have been any sense in general in even signing the treaty, since a side wishing to violate it would have been able to do so through its allies and to double or triple its potential.

Now that the United States has renounced the SALT II treaty, it has become even more obvious that this line on the part of the American side of undermining the SALT II treaty was programmed in advance. First, the treaty was not ratified. Then the circumvention of the treaty was perpetrated. Now the treaty is, as they say, being demolished by the American side.

[Unidentified announcer] The participants of the press conference answered other questions from journalists.

Bessmertnykh on U.S. Charges

LD041218 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1106 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun (TASS)--The announcement of the U.S. refusal to observe the provisional agreement of 1972 on certain measures in the field of the limitation of strategic offensive armaments and the 1979 treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments has provoked condemnation throughout the world, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs stated today at a Moscow press center news conference. Understanding that the declared course runs counter to the fundamental interests of all peoples, the leading figures in the U.S. Administration would like to obscure the sense of

what has been accomplished to the maximum extent. However, the White House version for justifying the motives and real cause of its actions does not stand up to comparison with the real facts, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stressed.

The U.S. representatives, including the President, are attempting to justify their decision with certain Soviet violations of the provisional agreement and the SALT II treaty. In doing so, references are made to the appearance in the USSR of an alleged second new type of ICBM, the SS-25, and to "excessive enciphering" of telemetric information during missile test launches. In this context the building of a radar station in Krasnoyarsk is mentioned though that radar station has no relation to the SALT II treaty. Not one of those assertions has any serious foundation, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated. The Soviet Union has shown repeatedly, with concrete data, that the United States is consciously distorting the picture and distracting attention from its own violations of treaties and agreements. And the more they talk about Soviet "violations," the more the truth becomes obvious.

Having refused to observe the provisional agreement and the SALT II treaty, the U.S. Administration would at the same time also like to gain some kind of political capital. Presenting it as if they will "technically" observe the SALT II treaty for another few months, the U.S. declares that throughout this time they will observe the behavior of the Soviet side and "take it into consideration." Such an approach to the issue is absurd at any time, but even more so now. Treaty violators cannot take upon themselves the role of guardian of these treaties. And into the bargain, the treaty and agreement cannot be declared "dead" while at the same time being observed, even "technically."

One can summarize Washington's present course in the following way:

If one or another U.S. military program conflicts with existing treaty limitations, then the agreements are thrown out and priority is given to arms, the USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs pointed out. This path will bring Washington no good, either from the point of view of strengthening the security of the United States itself, or from the point of view of Soviet-U.S. relations or the development of a common situation in the world.

Akhromeyev on Soviet Response

LD041154 Moscow TASS in English 1138 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, June 4 TASS--If the United States withdraws from the SALT-1 and SALT-2 accords, the limitations on strategic offensive armaments will become void, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of staff of the Soviet armed forces and first deputy minister of defense of the USSR, said at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists here. The first limitation to be cancelled, he continued, will be that of the numbers of intercontinental ballistic missiles under the SALT-1 interim agreement. The next will be that on the deployment of submarines carrying ballistic missiles. All the restrictions on the numbers of warheads, both on ground-based intercontinental ballistic missiles and on submarine-launched missiles, will be nullified.

If the United States goes beyond the SALT-1 and SALT-2 limits in deploying its strategic armaments, the Soviet Union will find a sufficiently adequate response. We have the right to and will lawfully take such measures, Marshal Akhromeyev stressed.

Bessmertnykh on Possibility of Summit

LD041537 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Excerpts] A news conference on strategic offensive weapons has been held in Moscow. Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh reminded Soviet and foreign newsmen that a few days ago the United States Administration took a step to spur the arms race: President Reagan said the United States refused to observe in the future the 1972 interim agreement on a number of measures in the sphere of limiting strategic offensive armaments and the 1979 treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive armaments.

On the prospects for a Soviet-American summit meeting, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said that such a meeting couldn't be isolated from the processes taking place in the world and in Soviet-American relations. The U.S. Administration speaks for a summit but in practice does everything to undermine the possibility of such a meeting. The news conference paid special attention to the claims of the Washington administration that the Soviet Union doesn't observe its commitments either under the interim agreement on strategic arms limitation, SALT I, or the SALT II treaty.

The chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev, who also attended the news conference, stressed that the charges were ill-intentioned lies and that the United States resorted to them with the sole purpose of renouncing the observation of these very important agreements.

He said the Soviet Union scrupulously and conscientiously observes all the arms limitation agreements it has signed. All the requirements of the SALT I interim agreement and the SALT II treaty are carried out as punctually [as heard]. Marshal Akhromeyev said that the Soviet Union would not remain indifferent if the United States denounced strategic offensive arms limitation agreement. I believe, the marshal said, that the Soviet Union will find sufficiently effective ways of possible action, if, in violation of the interim agreement and the SALT II treaty, the United States starts deploying its strategic armaments.

Participants in the news conference answered numerous questions asked by journalists.

AFP Report

AU040413 Paris AFP in English 1336 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, June 4 (AFP)--U.S.-Soviet relations are unlikely to improve in the near future and without such an improvement hopes of holding a Gorbachev-Reagan summit meeting this year are dim, Soviet officials said here Wednesday.

"Holding a new Gorbachev-Reagan summit cannot be isolated from improving relations between the two countries, especially concerning security," new deputy foreign affairs minister Alexsandr Bessmertnykh told a news conference.

He would not however rule out a summit between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. "We must wait and see," he said.

Soviet first deputy defence minister and chief of staff Marshal Sergey Akhromeyev meanwhile denied that the Soviet Union had violated limits imposed by the 1979 Second Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-II).

Replying to violations alleged by the United States, Mr. Akhromeyev said construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar in Siberia had nothing to do with SALT II and did not violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) treaty either.

He reiterated a Soviet 1985 offer to scrap the construction if the United States would dismantle early warning radars at Flyingdales, England and Thule, Greenland, which he called "serious violations" of the ABM treaty.

Mr. Akhromeyev said the RS-12 intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) was only a modernized version of the RS-22 allowed by the SALT treaties, and that Moscow had given Washington "all the pertinent information" about the missile at the Geneva disarmament talks.

He denied U.S. allegations that the Soviet military were disguising data concerning missiles being tested.

Mr. Akhromeyev also reaffirmed that Moscow would "find sufficiently efficient means" to maintain military parity should Washington implement its threatened abandonment of SALT-II limits.

He mentioned a possible increase of Soviet ICBM strength by boosting the number of multiple warheads they haul.

Mr. Bessmertnykh said U.S. plans to stop observing the SALT-II limits would have "a negative impact" on the Geneva disarmament talks because the treaty served as "a concrete and solid platform from which progress could be made."

SDI, INF Issues Raised

LD041525 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1400 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, Jun 4 (TASS)--The Reagan administration's refusal to stay bound by the limits of the SALT II treaty smashes Washington's main argument that the purpose of the SDI is to relieve the United States of the burden of nuclear arms, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR stated at a press conference here today. This action of the administration reconfirms the well-known opinion of the Soviet Union that the "star wars" program is aimed at acquiring a first-strike capability. In such a case, the United States would have, figuratively speaking, a sword--up-to-date strategic offensive arms which would be built up in an uncontrolled manner,

and also a space shield in the form of space strike weapons. But this scenario, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh emphasized, will not work.

The Soviet Union will find an effective, quick and less costly reply than the U.S. program.

The deputy minister of foreign affairs emphasized that the deployment of U.S. 'Pershing-2' medium-range and cruise missiles in the territory of Western Europe undermines the SALT II treaty. Those missiles, he said, are capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union and therefore are a substantial addition to the strategic potential of the United States. Having deployed, and continuing to deploy the missiles, the U.S. side thereby seriously violates one of the basic provisions of the SALT II treaty: The principle of recognizing the equality and equal security of the sides.

Sergey Akhromeyev confirmed that with the U.S. departure from the SALT I and SALT II agreements, limitations on strategic offensive weapons lose their force. First to lose its force is the curb on the deployment of a quantity of ICBM's. This curb was envisaged by the provisional SALT I agreement. Further, the limitation on the deployment of a number of submarines with ballistic missiles loses its force. All curbs on the number of warheads, both on earth-based ICBM's and submarine-based missiles also lose their force.

If the United States starts to deploy its strategic weapons above the limits defined by SALT I and SALT II, Sergey Akhromeyev said, the Soviet Union will find sufficient effective retaliatory measures. We have the right, and will legally take such measures, he emphasized.

Marshal Akhromeyev refuted U.S. claims that the Soviet Union has created two new types of intercontinental ballistic missiles. SALT II provides for one only. The Soviet Union, Sergey Akhromeyev stressed, has tested an inter-continental ballistic missile of one type only, the RS-22. This is permitted under the SALT II treaty. The same missile, which is called SS-25 in the West, is the missile RS-12M, or the modernized RS-12 missile. Such modernization is also not prohibited by SALT II, and it is being performed in strict adherence with provisions of the treaty. We have informed the United States about it in detail. All talk about the Soviet Union violating the treaty, Marshal Akhromeyev went on to say, started after the present U.S. administra-tion came to office. The planning was long-term: First, to accuse the USSR, and then, on the basis of that, to say: Here we go, we are not going to stick to these accords any more. That is the meaning of the absolutely unfounded allegations that the USSR violates the treaty.

The U.S. refusal to adhere to the SALT II accords will negatively affect the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh noted. It is hard to believe the sincerity of intentions of the United States to strive for reaching new agreements if it violates already existing ones, and undermines the foundation on which the talks on strategic offensive armaments were built. The interlinked nature of the issues under discussion in Geneva exists and has been recognized by both sides. And, if a complex situation shapes itself in one of the three principal areas--space armaments, strategic offensive weapons, medium-range armaments--this cannot but tell on the general atmosphere at the talks.

The current state of Soviet-U.S. relations does not arouse optimism, the deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs said. The specific nature of the relations between the USSR and the United States is determined primarily by the state of affairs in the sphere of security. And in this particular sphere, right now, we are meeting the biggest difficulties. The Geneva talks, which are bound to lead to further-reaching agreements, are at a standstill. It is not the blame of the Soviet Union that this is so, he said.

TASS Summary

LD041445 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 4 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow, June 4 TASS--The Reagan administration's refusal to stay bound by the limits of the SALT-2 treaty smashes Washington's main argument that the purpose of the SDI is to relieve the Americans of the burden of nuclear arms, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, stated at a press conference here today. This action of the administration only confirms once again the well-known opinion of the Soviet Union that the "star wars" programme is aimed at acquiring a first-strike capability. In that case the United States would have, figuratively speaking, a sword--up-to-date strategic offensive arms which would be built up in an uncontrolled manner, and a space shield in the form of space strike weapons. But this scenario, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh emphasised, won't work.

The Soviet Union will find a reply, an effective, quick enough, and less costly one than the U.S. programme.

The deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR emphasised that already the very deployment of U.S. 'Pershing-2' medium-range and cruise missiles in the territory of Western Europe undermined the SALT-2 treaty. Those missiles, he said, are capable of reaching the territory of the Soviet Union and, therefore, turn into a substantial addition to the strategic potential of the United States. Having deployed and continuing to deploy the missiles, the U.S. side thereby seriously violates one of the basic provisions of the SALT-2 treaty: the principle of recognising the equality and equal security of the sides.

By renouncing further adherence to the SALT-1 interim agreement and the SALT-2 treaty, the U.S. Administration would like to lay the blame for that on the Soviet Union, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev, chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR--the first deputy minister of defence, stated at the press conference. By offering to the Soviet Union a certain new substitute regime instead of the SALT treaty, U.S. officials pass over the third component of their strategic triad--heavy bombers, as well as the fourth component--long-range cruise missiles. In other words, Sergey Akhromeyev emphasised, the USA reserves the right to deploy eight thousand such missiles. Actually the U.S. proposal is directed towards further arms race and constitutes an attempt at exhausting the Soviet Union through such a race.

Sergey Akhromeyev pointed out that after the USA had abandoned the SALT-1 and SALT-2 treaties, the limitations on strategic offensive armaments became invalid. The first to become invalid is the limit on the number of deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles. It was envisaged by the interim SALT-1 treaty. Then the limit on the number of deployed submarines with ballistic missiles also becomes invalid. All limitations on the number of warheads both on intercontinental ground-based ballistic missiles and submarine-launched missiles are thus invalidated too.

If the United States starts deploying its strategic arms above the limits determined by SALT-1 and SALT-2, Sergey Akhromeyev said, the Soviet Union will find sufficiently effective counter-measures. We have the right, and will legitimately adopt such measures.

Marshal Akhromeyev refuted the claims by the United States side that the Soviet Union created two new types of an intercontinental ballistic missile, while the SALT-2 treaty permits only one. The Soviet Union, Sergey Akhromeyev stressed, tested only one type of an intercontinental ballistic missile which we call RS-12M missile or a modernised RS-12 missile. Such a modernisation is not prohibited under the SALT-2 treaty either, and it is done in strict conformity with the provisions of the treaty. We have informed the American side about that in detail. All talk that the Soviet side is violating the treaty, Marshal Akhromeyev continued, began only after the current U.S. Administration came to power.

The plans have been conceived for a long time--first to accuse the USSR, and then proceeding from that to be able to say: Well now, we will not abide by these agreements too. Here is the essence of the totally unfounded accusations against the USSR that it violates the treaty.

The refusal of the USA to observe the SALT treaty will have a negative effect on the current talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh pointed out. It is hard to believe in the sincerity of the intentions of the U.S. side to press ahead for new agreements, if it violates the already existing ones, undermines the foundation on which the talks on strategic offensive weapons were built. There is an interconnection between the questions under discussion in Geneva, which is recognised by both sides.

And if in some of the three main areas--space weapons, strategic offensive weapons, medium-range weapons, a difficult situation arises, this cannot but tell on the general atmosphere at the talks.

The state of Soviet-American relations does not arouse optimism today, the USSR deputy foreign minister said. The specific character of relations between the USSR and the USA lies in the fact that they are determined above all by the situation in the field of security.' It is in that field that we are precisely now faced with the greatest difficulties. The Geneva talks which should lead to farther-reaching agreements are marking time. And the Soviet Union is not to blame for such a state of affairs, he said.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1424

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS HIGHLIGHTS NUCLEAR ARMS IN U.S.-JAPANESE EXERCISES

LD091425 Moscow TASS in English 1403 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 9 TASS -- Political News analyst Askold Biryukov writes:

Today the United States and Japan have started new joint military exercises off Japan's Honshu Island. Taking part in them are ten Japanese destroyers, three ships of the American 7th Fleet, submarines and P-3C anti-submarine planes. The stated aim of the exercises is for the allies to train in the conduct of anti-submarine warfare.

It also became known today that the Armed Forces of the United States and Japan, as reported by the Japanese newspaper "AKAHATA", are working out plans of jointly attacking the Soviet maritime territory, Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands in the event of a "Contingency". Referring to official and military sources "AKAHATA" notes that the programme of joint Japanese-American operations to "ensure control" over the north-western part of the Pacific, which is now being drawn up in great secrecy, provides for "landing troops on the Kuril Islands". In January, the paper goes on, the commander of the American Marine Corps General Paul Kelly admitted in an article printed in a specialised collection that "with the help of allies" the Pentagon intends to strike simultaneous blows at Sakhalin, the Kuril Islands, the Black Sea coast, eastern Baltic, etc.

The semi-official centre of strategic studies, that used to function in Tokyo, had prepared a report saying that in the event of a flareup of hostilities in any other area, for instance, in Central America, Japanese forces, depending on the situation, should be prepared jointly with the Armed Forces of the United States or even by themselves to attack the Soviet Far East, including the central part of maritime territory. The use of nuclear arms is "possible" in the course of such an operation, the report noted.

Matters are not limited to planning such aggressive actions. The necessary infrastructure for their implementation is being created and war games are being used to practice combat interaction of the United States and its allies in the Asian-Pacific region. The area of United States military bases on Hokkaido Island has been trebled in the past three and a half years alone.

"F-16" fighter-bombers, known to have a nuclear capability, are deployed in the north of Japan. They engage in joint exercises with Japanese "F-15" all-weather fighters intended to provide them with cover as they deliver massive strikes at ground targets. Tokyo has been drawn into the "Fleetex" regular United States naval exercises designed to determine the strength of the Soviet Union's Far Eastern defences.

The large-scale "Rimpac-86" naval exercises of the United States in the area of the Hawaii Islands are being conducted on a similarly provocative basis. Their scenario, as evidenced by the Japanese press, is in line with the American plans of delivering a strike at the Soviet Far Eastern coast in the area of Vladivostok, Kamchatka and the Kuril Islands.

But a new provocation is already in the making. In August the Pentagon plans to hold exercises of a naval strike force headed by the "New Jersey" battleship armed with "Tomohawk" nuclear-tipped cruise missiles in the Sea of Japan near Soviet shores. Besides this battleship the exercises will involve also other United States naval ships with nuclear-missile weapons on board. To quote the Japanese newspaper "ASAHI" the American "Tomahawks" will play the role of "a knife presed to the Soviet Union's throat" during these exercises which are said to be of the nature of special reconnaissance.

These exercises, the paper writes, will be of an "exceptionally provocative nature" in respect of the USSR. And notwithstanding this there are officials in Japan who believe that that country's "self-defence force" could take part, if only "partly", in these militaristic games as well.

The above-stated only confirms the urgency of the recent Soviet Government statement on the situation in the Asian-Pacific region, the well-foundedness of the concern expressed in it over such actions by the United States and its allies leading to a dangerous growth of tension in that part of the globe.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1421

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW: UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR BASE BEING BUILT IN ROK

SK070908 Moscow International Service in Korean 1130 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] According to foreign press reports form Seoul, a new underground nuclear (?base) is being constructed at a location a few kilometers from Camp (Oasis):

Camp(Oasis), a U.S. military base that is one of the 40 large-scale Pentagon facilities on the Korean peninsula, is deployed near Kongju in South Chungchong Province. In (?1983), the South Korean authorities and the U.S. military (?authorities) forcibly made all the residents of this area move.

This area has been surrounded by barbed wire and proclaimed an off-limits area. The facilities are treated as top secret. Under the pretext of ensuring state security and keeping it confidential, a national assemblyman of the South Korean opposition party was prevented form making a query in Seoul's National Assembly. Even a noting of this fact was deleted in the minutes of the National Assembly.

The secret, hovever, is being revealed. As noted by a foreign publication, the Pentagon is planning to move a U.S. nuclear base from Okinawa, Japan to Camp (Oasis). Even without this, South Korea has been turned into a large U.S. nuclear base complex. Some 1,000 nuclear weapons are stockpiled in the area south of the 38th Parallel. In terms of capacity, this is more than (?820) times that of the atomic bomb that the United States dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 [words indistinct] U.S. nuclear weapons are now deployed in an area of 100 sq km in South Korea.

"Team Spirit," an annual military exercise, is conducted for a hypothetical nuclear attack. For instance, an exercise for using a nuclear weapon was conducted in the landing exercise of Navy and Air Force ground warfare units near Pohang in the course of the "Team Spirit-86" military exercise this past spring.

It is time that Washington and Seoul listened to the voice of reason and stopped encouraging the source of the misfortune of tension and war, but they have not done so. The situation on the Korean peninsula remains an entangled [word indistinct] knot in the Far East because of the imperialist maneuvers.

Building up nuclear weapons in South Korea, Washington is making this region [words indistinct] for confrontation with the socialist countries and nuclear [words indistinct].

/9738
CSO: 5200/1421

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

FRG CRUISE MISSILE PLANS--Bonn, 9 Jun (TASS)--TASS correspondent Vladimir Serov reports: The major FRG military industrial concerns Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm and Dornier are working jointly with U.S. and UK firms on the creation of long-range cruise missiles. In a secret Bundeswehr arms production plan for 1987, the allocation of financial resources for this has already been envisaged. This is reported by the Hamburg magazine DER SPIEGEL. Bonn officialdom then gave an assurance that the FRG intends to produce neither strategic bombers nor long-range cruise missiles. Meanwhile, as can be seen from the DER SPIEGEL article, the FRG's conservative government, which came to power three years ago and expresses the interests of the military-industrial complex, has already in secret and away from the public view been preparing itself to make full use of the new opportunities to escalate armament. The long-range cruise missiles in question, which are intended to be launched from aircraft, have a range of over 400 km and are intended to strike targets deep in the enemy's defense. [Excerpts] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1432 GMT 9 Jun 86 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1421

CHEMICAL/BIOLOCICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW: U.S. TO DEPLOY CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN EUROPE, ASIA

LD022333 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 2 Jun 86

[Excerpts] The American Congress is getting ready to earmark an additional $138 million for the Pentagon to put out chemical artillery charges and Big Eye air bombs. This action was preceded by the approval by the NATO military-political bloc of the Pentagon plans for updating chemical weapons arsenals in Western Europe. And the ammunition of the Big Eye type is intended to be deployed not only in Europe but also in Asia.

As is known, in the Pentagon chemical weapons are simply called weapons of the future, putting a special meaning into this definition. According to estimates of American specialists, the production of toxic agents sufficient to eliminate one person is 40 times cheaper than the production of conventional weapons for these purposes, to say nothing of nuclear weapons. The fact that the losses among civilians, in case of the use of chemical weapons, are on the average over 20 times greater than the losses caused by them in the fighting armies, bothers the Pentagon strategists, but very little. But it is precisely to Asia, the most densely populated continent, that the United States is sending its huge arsenals of chemical weapons. They have already been stockpiled in Japan and on Deigo Garcia Island. Talks are going on about their deployment in the ASEAN countries. The Delhi newspaper NATIONAL HERALD reports that the 82nd Division of the U.S. Army, included in the rapid deployment corps, is being armed with combat toxic agents.

Great danger is posed to the population of the countries where the Pentagon's chemical weapons are deployed, also by their possible leak during stockpiling or transportation.

The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have repeatedly proposed to outlaw these weapons and to eliminate their stocks and to stop their production. The response to these peace initiatives was the U.S.'s new steps for developing updated types of noiseless death and expanding the geography of their deployment. This provides fresh evidence that in its striving to suppress the national liberation movements throughout the world, the American Administration is ready to commit any crime, including such a barbarous crime as the use of chemical weapons.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: 'RECKLESSNESS, ADVENTURISM' OF U.S. CW PROGRAM HIT

PM031517 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (Second Edition) in Russian 1 Jun 86 p 3

[Captain Second Rank B. Kuzar "Military-Political Review": "Following the Course of Recklessness and Adventurism"]

[Text] "I assert that peace is inevitable. The day will come when guns will become museum exhibits and the museum visitors, looking at them in amazement, will think:

Is it possible that such barbarism existed?" These words were spoken by V. Hugo almost 150 years ago. Unfortunately, the great French writer's prophecy has still not materialized. Through the fault of imperialist reaction and aggression, the process of stockpiling increasingly sophisticated instruments of death is continuing, while people die every day and every hour from violence and wars in different parts of the globe.

The contemporary world is threatened by monstrously large potentials of destruction and annihilation. "We already have enough nuclear weapons to organize 600,000 Hiroshimas and 2,400 wars like World War II." B Schneider, a would-be arms control expert in the U.S. State Department, declared. But even this "potential" does not satisfy the Western politicians. They pursue with manic stubbornness the further buildup of the arms race and the expansion of military preparations. The recent decisions made by the North Atlantic block leading military-political organs are a new act of this policy of recklessness and adventurism.

It has already been reported that the scheduled sessions of NATO's Military Committee, Eurogroup, and Military Planning Committee were held in Brussels 21-22 May. The Nuclear Planning Group held its session somewhat earlier, while a session of the NATO Council was held in the Canadian city of Halifax on 29-30 May.

The results of these conferences testify that NATO's nuclear strategy is suicidal and catastrophic. The Chernobyl tragedy revealed yet again what an abyss would open up if a nuclear war were to befall mankind. But the sessions of both NATO's Eurogroup and its Military Planning Committee spoke again of the need to build up the "nuclear deterrence forces," which is to be taken to mean primarily the first-strike weapons. Gratification was expressed with the course of the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe. It is well known that all the 109 planned launch installations for Pershing-2 missiles are already deployed on FRG territory and, as far as cruise missiles are concerned, the Western press reports that more than 190 of them have been introduced into the continent.

Approval was also given to Britain's efforts to build up its nuclear potential. While the NATO meetings were being held, the news agencies reported from Moscow the nen Soviet proposal expressed during M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with British parliamentarians. If Britain were to make the official decision to eliminate its nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union would be prepared to effect an equivalent reduction in its nuclear potential. And if, at the same time, it were to remove foreign nuclear weapons from its territory, the Soviet Union would also guarantee that its nuclear weapons will not be targeted on British territory and will never be used against Britain. But the Atlanticists pretended that they "did not notice" this proposal and continued playing the same old tune.

Conventional weapons were another object of particular attention at the Atlanticists' sessions: Primarily the plans to create [sozdaniye] those types of conventional weapons whose casualty-inflicting capabilities are similar to those of tactical nuclear weapons. The dangerous nature of these plans is obvious: The dividing line between conventional and nuclear weapons is being eroded. According to reports in LES NOUVELLES ATLANTIQUES bulletin, NATO defense ministers examined, within the framework of both the Eurogroup and the Military Planning Committee, various aspects of the implementation of the program of "defense initiative in the conventional weapons sphere." They cover the manufacture and procurement of newgeneration nonnuclear weapons on a vast scale over the 5-year period between 1987 and 1992.

This program also includes the "modernization of forces equipped with medium tanks," the improvement of antitank forces and means, the creation [sozdaniye] of more effective systems to combat second-echelon forces, the enhanced readiness and utilization potential of naval forces, and the accomplishment of other tasks resulting in the buildup of the aggressive might of NATO countries' armed forces.

Emphasis was placed in this connection on an annual 3-percent increase in real terms of the bloc countries' military budgets, and also on the efficient utilization of resources and improved cooperation and coordination in arms production.

The agenda of the conferences also included the question of creating [sozdaniye] an ABM system in Europe, the so-called Euro-SDI. It has to be emphasized that NATO circles already openly admit that this system is part and parcel of the U.S. SDI program. In the words of General (Yager), chairman of NATO's Military Committee, an unbreakable link exists between the Euro-SDI and the U.S. SDI. Moreover, the European component is due to become operational before the implementation of the entire "star wars" program.

A particular position was occupied at the NATO ministers sessions by a discussion of the Pentagon's plans to embark on large-scale series production of a new type of chemical weapon -- binary munitions -- but this time specifically for Western Europe. It is planned to produce several varieties of this sophisticated weapon: 155-mm artillery shells, "Big Eye" aerial bombs, warheads for rocket artillery, and subsequently also for "lance" missiles. While at present the U.S. arsenal of "silent death" includes more than 3 million shells, tens of thousands of aerial bombs, hundreds of thousands of mortar shells and landmines, and a multiplicity of other chemical ammunition, it will almost double when binary chemical weapons go into service.

U.S. chemical weapons are already present in Western Europe. They were secretly transported there back in the postwar years. According to West German press data, for example, there are about 4 million liters of highly toxic nerve gas in the FRG. Specialists estimate that this quantity would be sufficient to destroy Europe's entire population. The military journal STRATEGIGUE writes that the poisonous cloud could annihilate the population within a 20 to 30-km radius of the location of the chemical weapons' use.

Proceeding on the basis of hegemonist desire and hiding behind walls about a "Soviet chemical threat," the United States launched a veritable "gas attack" on its bloc partners. Taking part in it were Defense Secretary C. Weinberger and U.S. General B. Rogers NATO supreme allied commander in Europe. The loyal U.S. allies -- Britain and the FRG -- acted as a kind of lobbyist for Europe's "chemicalization." According to the DAILY TELEGRAPH, the session of NATO's Military Planning Committee elaborated a special procedure which "did not allow a single European representative to vote against this plan." The carrot was used simultaneously with the stick: The West Europeans were promised "participation in the event of a crisis situation" in deciding when to start the practical transfer of binary weapons. But this is camouflage covering the Pentagon's true intentions. These were revealed by U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense R. Perle himself. In an outburst of frankness he said outright that there can be no question of any crisis situation, since binary ammunition is meant for deployment in Western Europe even in peacetime. The journal DER SPIEGEL reported that the Pentagon has drawn up a detailed plan for the transportation of the new chemical weapons to Europe. The plan also includes the areas where they will be deployed in the FRG: near Hanau, Mannheim, Allgay, Pirmasens, and the Black Forest.

The dangerous new U.S. plans have caused alarm and protests all over the world, and primarily in Western Europe. Broad circles of the West European public are demanding that their governments say "no" to Washington's latest militarist venture aimed at upsetting the worldwide equilibrium of forces and at attaining military superiority. A statement by the Social Democratic Party of Germany Presidium says that the FRG Government must, jointly with the governments of other NATO countries, reject the deployment of chemical weapons in Western Europe.

The Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Greece, Luxembourg, and Iceland took a negative stance toward the U.S. "chemicalization" plans.

Heading public opinion, their representatives at the NATO conferences spoke against the production of binary munitions. But Washington had no intention of heeding their voices. So much for the notorious "Atlantic solidarity."

The results of the latest NATO sessions displayed once again for the whole world to see the threat that this aggressive military group poses to people. Throughout its entire existence it has, under the leadership of the United States, engaged in nothing but preparations to launch a new world war. The Soviet Government, the statement published yesterday emphasizes, resolutely condemns the plans for NATO's chemical rearmament. It perceives it as its duty to once more draw the attention of the governments of the United States and other North Atlantic bloc member-states and of all European countries to the exceptional danger contained in these plans for the cause of peace in Europe and the world over. People must say "no" to binary and any other chemical weapons. But the peace-loving forces on the planet today have sufficient resolve and will to thwart the plans of imperialism and reaction through their joint efforts. The will of the millions is imbued with no less optimism than

the 19th century French writer and humanist. This optimism is generated by the USSR's constructive stance on questions of war and peace. In the recent past the Soviet Union has undertaken a number of actions of truly historic importance. It is sufficient to recall the program for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons on earth by the end of this century to become convinced how seriously our country approaches the fate of mankind.

In a demonstration of goodwill, the Soviet Union extended its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions through 6 August this year. This was a vivid demonstration of the new political thinking. In the nuclear age it is impossible to proceed only from the interests of one's own security, ignoring the interests of other countries' security. Relations between states must be built on the principles of equality, mutually advantageous cooperation, and identical security.

Time imperatively dictates: The time has come to abandon any illusions about gaining military superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Pact, be it on earth or in space. It is impossible to speak with the socialist world from positions of strength. Indeed, it is possible and necessary to sit around the negotiating table and discuss ways to build a comprehensive system of international security.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

IZVESTIYA ASSAILS U.S. CW PLANS IN EUROPE, URGES BAN

PM231120 Moscow IZVESTIYA (Morning Edition) in Russian 21 May 86 p 5

[Article by O. Molov: "The Shadow of the Binary Threat Over Western Europe"]

[Text] When nuclear munitions appeared 40 years ago, it looked as though they would make chemical weapons, which had been battlefield weapons for a long time, pointless and unnecessary. But it only looked that way. All these years the U.S. military, aiming to build up all types of armaments, has continued secret work on the creation of new toxins and chemical munitions to destroy all life on earth.

In recent years the U.S. Army has received examples of a new generation of these weapons--binary shells and bombs. But this is only the beginning. Other means of chemical destruction--warheads for operational-tactical and cruise missiles and modern volley fire systems--and various chemical weapon systems for aircraft--spraying devices, cluster bombs, and aerial bombs--are nearing completion. Next on the agenda is the start of large-scale production of binary chemical weapons, which is to be organized at the chemical plant which has already been constructed in Pine Bluff (Arkansas) and which is reckoned to be able to produce 70,000 binary munitions per month.

Representatives of the military-industrial complex and senior figures in the present administration have been unceremoniously pressuring the U.S. legislative organ. As a result Congress has allocated in fiscal 1986-1987 the funds to organize at the plant the startup of large-scale production of the first types of binary munitions--155-mm howitzer shells--and, at a later date, "Big Eye" 500-kg aerial bombs as well.

Thus mankind is effectively facing a new spiral in the chemical arms race. Washington's plan is that large-scale production of binary chemical weapons will be an integral part of the extensive program for the creation of brand-new armaments to give the United States military superiority in the confrontation with the Soviet Union. The U.S. aim is to deploy the new types of mass destruction weapons outside the United States, primarily in West European countries, closer to the borders of the Soviet Union and the

other socialist states. Official spokesmen for the Washington administration have stated very frankly and plainly on more than one occasion that the binary chemical weapons produced in the United States are intended primarily for Europe. U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense J. Wade, addressing Congress, stressed that the U.S. Army must be equipped with up-to-date types of chemical weapons in order to be able to wage a chemical war in Europe against the Warsaw Pact countries. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger himself never stops saying it: "If we want to have a really flexible strategy in Europe, we must modernize chemical weapons and increase their power." U.S. General B. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe, announced in February that his staff had already worked out all the plans for the deployment of the new binary munitions in Europe and the use of them in wartime. Procedures have also been elaborated for consultations with the participating countries' leaders on the question of deployment of these weapons.

In paving the way for the Pentagon to fix itself up with binary weapons, the U.S. legislators imposed one condition: The West European allies of the United States have to agree to the deployment of these weapons on their territory in the event of a "crisis." And the entire machinery of existing means of indoctrination was activated for that purpose--persuasion, overtures, bribery, cajolery, threats, and blackmail. The Rogers plan was approved 28 April at a NATO Military Planning Committee session in Brussels. It is now on the agenda of the upcoming bloc [NATO] defense ministers' meeting in Brussels, and the intention is that it will then be ratified at the May session of the NATO Council in Halifax (Canada), attended by the NATO foreign ministers.

The implementation of Washington's plans for the production of chemical weapons and their deployment in the West European countries, where the density of military confrontation is the highest in the world, would pose the threat of Europe's being turned into a potential theater of devastating chemical war, with the civilian population as the main victims. According to Western experts' calculations, civilian losses would be 20-30 times higher than military losses. Thus the United States is trying to turn Europe into a "dual hostage"--to chemical as well as nuclear weapons.

The U.S. planned deployment of binary chemical weapons in Europe is a threat not only to the population of the socialist countries, but also to the population of the United States' NATO allies in Europe.

The advocates of the new chemical weapons are trying to present them as defensive weapons whose alleged purpose is to "deter" the Warsaw Pact countries from using such weapons. But these claims are deliberately intended to deceive the European peoples, because, in fact, their sole purpose is to blunt vigilance at all costs and secure the consent of the governments of the West European countries, above all the FRG and Britain, to the delivery and deployment of binary stocks there.

Washington's planned switch to the mass production of a new generation of barbaric weapons flies in the face of the efforts of the Soviet Union, which is doing all it can to ban chemical weapons and destroy them as soon as possible. The United States and NATO are torpedoing initiatives by the USSR and the other socialist countries aimed at ridding Europe of chemical weapons, in particular, setting up zones free from these weapons. The reason for this is simple: The Pentagon and NATO see the creation of such zones as a real barrier to the deployment of U.S. chemical agents on the European continent.

Scarcely anyone would deny that the deployment of binary chemical weapons in Western Europe would have the most adverse effect on the talks taking place on the universal prohibition of chemical weapons within the framework of the Disarmament Conference on Geneva. It would be yet another serious obstacle to the elaboration of an international convention precluding the possibility of the use of these mass destruction weapons for all time.

The development of large-scale production of the new variety of chemical weapons within the context of the elaboration of an international convention on banning and destroying them undermines confidence in all official statements by U.S. spokesmen on their "commitment" to a positive solution of the question of banning chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union resolutely condemns plans for the production and deployment of binary chemical weapons in Western Europe and believes that the U.S. Government bears the chief responsibility for the consequences of such a step. But responsibility is also assumed by the figures in West European countries who, to please Washington, are prepared to flood Western Europe with the new weapons, which bring silent binary death, hard on the heels of the U.S. first-strike missiles deployed on the territory of a number of NATO countries. It is the direct duty of the peoples to prevent these dangerous plans from being implemented.

There can be no place for chemical weapons on earth. The USSR advocates the speediest, complete elimination not only of chemical weapon stocks, but of the actual industrial base manufacturing them. Our country sees the implementation of this task in the present century as entirely realistic. Reinforcing its statements with practical action, the Soviet Union submitted on 22 April at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva new proposals which eliminate the differences that have existed in the past and contribute to the activation of talks on concluding in the immediate future an international convention aimed at the total and universal destruction of chemical weapons by the end of the 20th century.

The substance of the new Soviet proposals is as follows. The destruction of chemical weapon stocks should be started by every state that is party to the convention in six months' time at the latest, and the destruction or dismantling of production facilities must begin no later than 1 year after the convention comes into effect. And 30 days after that moment

the participants would have to announce the precise location of every facility producing chemical weapons, including the components of so-called binary weapons. This applies to all such facilities, irrespective of whether they are state-owned or private.

The Soviet Union proposes that the halting of operations at every facility producing chemical weapons, including private enterprises, be ensured through strict verification [kontrol], including systematic international on-site inspections [proverki na mestakh]. In order to ensure effective verification [kontrol] of the destruction and dismantling of chemical weapon production facilities, the Soviet Union proposes making provision for carrying out systematic international on-site inspections [proverki na mestakh] and elaborating a procedure for visits to facilities by international inspectors whereby their presence at all operations to destroy or dismantle that facility would be ensured.

The future convention would provide for strict measures ensuring its unswerving observance and fulfillment by every state, irrespective of whether state and private enterprises or transnational corporations are involved, and, above all, the nonuse of the commercial chemical industry for the creation and production of chemical weapons.

The Soviet Union is prepared to make reasonable compromises in the search for ways of solving the problem and banning chemical weapons. It has honestly traveled its half of the road to the attainment of this goal. If the United States really wants the speediest conclusion of a convention banning these weapons, it must take answering steps. The ball is in Washington's court.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA CONTRASTS WESTERN, USSR ATTITUDES TOWARD CW

PM050818 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 3 Jun 86 p 4

[N. Shchertakov article: "Eliminating the Chemical Threat"]

[Text] Through the fault of the United States a threat on an unprecedented scale from one of the most barbaric types of mass destruction weapons -- chemical weapons -- is hanging over our planet. The course set by Washington toward pressing ahead with the production of the latest generation of these weapons, binary nerve gas munitions, is becoming a most dangerous reality. In recent days NATO military organs adopted decisions sanctioning these U.S. plans.

Never before has this question been so much in the balance: Will events develop or will the world be thrust into an extremely dangerous round of the race in means of "silent death?" After all, it is a question of a considerable qualitative and quantitative buildup of the already massive U.S. chemical weapons arsenal. The Washington administration intends to allocate almost $3 billion for the development and production of the various systems of binary munitions in the initial stages alone.

The implementation of the dangerous U.S. plans presents Europe with the threat of being transformed into a potential theater of a destructive chemical war. Washington's planned deployment of binary charges in Western Europe could have a most negative impact on the talks on banning chemical weapons and seriously undermine the trust necessary if they are to progress. The U.S. actions go against the Soviet-American accords achieved in Geneva on a general and complete ban on chemical weapons and their destruction and on stepping up efforts to conclude an effective international convention on this subject that would lend itself to verification [kontrol]. Washington's words about its "devotion" to the cause of chemical disarmament are not worth much if this is the U.S. and NATO response to the Soviet peace initiatives in this area introduced last month.

The USSR, as the published Soviet Government statement says, resolutely condemns the plans for the chemical rearmament of NATO. The Soviet Government considers it its duty to draw the attention of the U.S. and other NATO state governments and the governments of all European countries to the exceptional danger that these plans pose for the cause of peace in Europe and throughout the world.

The responsibility for all the pernicious consequences of the adventurist policy of building up chemical arms will have to be borne, in addition to Washington, also by its closest allies who in one way or another indulge the dangerous plans of the U.S. Administration. This applies above all to the FRG which hastened to support the

production of binary weapons in the United States, the first country to do so. Bonn's assurances that binary chemical weapons will allegedly be sited on FRG territory only in "crisis situations" are a ploy designed to mislead its own population. As soon as binary weapons appear in U.S. arsenals, they will inevitably be deployed in the areas for which they are intended, and these include the territory of the FRG. Thus the FRG population stands to get more than it has bargained for, as the saying goes.

The Soviet Union is countering the U.S. and NATO line toward the chemical arms race with a course aimed at chemical disarmament. There is no other option in the present age.

The plan for the quickest total elimination of chemical weapons and also of the industrial base for their production is part and parcel of the disarmament program set forth in the 15 January statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

At the end of April the Soviet delegation put forward a new package of initiatives devoted to this problem at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. The USSR proposed in particular that the destruction of the stocks of chemical weapons be begun by each participant state within the shortest possible time -- no later than 6 months after the agreement comes into force (for the sake of comparison, I would like to mention that the U.S. position provides for an "interval" of 1 year to elapse before the beginning of these operations).

In order to ensure the timely identification of the location of enterprises for the production of chemical weapons including enterprises producing binary weapon components, the Soviet Union has proposed that the participant states submit official declarations within 30 days of the agreement coming into force stating whether they have (or had) such production installations on their territory, specifying their number regardless of their ownership (state or private, present or past) and stating on whose orders (under what agreement, contract) these installations were built and operate (operated) for the purpose of the production of chemical weapons, indicating the precise location of each installation.

The Soviet delegation also set forth specific proposals for the prompt cessation of the production of chemical weapons and discontinuation of operations at installations producing these weapons (A ban on the occupation of the premises, disconnection and dismantling of all services to the installation, and so forth). These measures are called upon to guarantee that the production of chemical means of destruction at the installations in question stops without delay when the agreement comes into force and that these installations are closed down. Our principled approach to the elaboration o of the procedures for the dismantling of the chemical weapons production base was also clearly defined. It is proposed that demolition or dismantling of the enteprises for the production of these weapons begin no later than 1 year after the agreement comes into force.

It is impossible to overlook the fact that the Soviet proposals are comprehensive in nature, form a logical sequence, and aim to resolve the question of the installations for the production of chemical weapons as a whole, a question which represents one of the key issues at the talks. The approach proposed by the USSR aims to ensure the interrelated and consistent implementation of the procedure for the identification of installations for the production of chemical weapons, the cessation of operations at these installations, and their closure and subsequent destruction or dismantling.

Thus the Soviet proposals make it possible in effect to eliminate the differences that have existed up to now in the positions of states on the whole range of questions connected with the destruction of the stocks of chemical weapons and of the installations for their production. They open up a realistic opportunity to agree within the very near future the main sections of a future international convention on banning chemical weapons.

This is backed up by the Soviet Union's innovative and bold approach to the verification [kontrol] of the cessation of the production of chemical weapons and the elimination of the enterprises for their production. We propose in particular that provision be made for systematic international on site inspections [proverka]. Arrangements would be made for international inspectors to be present during all the important operations in the destruction or dismantling of the installations in question. Our stance makes provision also for a final international inspection to ensure that this process has been completed. The Cessation of operations at instllations for the manufacture of chemical means of destruction would also be ensured by means of strict verification [kontrol] including systematic international on-site inspections. In other words, the USSR has clearly proved that it regards systematic international on-site verification [kontrol] as one of the most important forms of scrupulous verification [kontrol] of the observance of the main provisions of afuture convention. This completely refutes the unfounded claims of the West that the Soviet Union is allegedly not interested in effective verification, and especially international verification, of compliance with the agreement.

Thanks to the new Soviet initiatives at the talks on banning chemical weapons that have been going on since 1981 within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, a situation has developed where the states taking part in the talks (and there are more than 40 of them) have at their disposal everything they need to finalize the main sections of the future agreement.

However, this prospect now looks problematic in light of the implmentation by the United States and its closest NATO allies of the line toward the production and sitting of binary weapons in Western Europe. Judging by appearances, Washington still intends to use these talks as a screen for its "chemical rearmament" plan. The latest events confirm that the White House is not interested in cardinal solutions or progress in banning chemical weapons. This is also borne out by the conduct of the United States at the talks themselves.

Whereas the Soviet Union has been creatively developing its stance at the talks, the United States has "frozen" its own position at the level of the draft convention which it tabled in April 1984. It continues to stubbornly defend a number of ideas and st stereotype solutions contained in the aforementioned draft although it became obvious virtually as soon as the U.S. "initiative" was put forward that they lack substance and are unacceptable to the socialist states and indeed many other states. Nonetheless, Washington is trying to present its draft as the "most complete" and refuses to make any constructive changes. This refers above all to the unrealistic and destructive nature of the U.S. proposals on questions of verification [kontrol] and in particular the concept of indiscriminate international inspections by "standing invitation."

Understandably, Washington and its closest NATO allies, in steering a course toward the production of binary weapons and their siting in Europe, are not interested in the truth about the constructive new Soviet proposals reaching the broad public and political circles in the West. After all, this would utterly expose the pernicious nature of the U.S. and NATO course toward swamping Europe with chemical weapons and would highlight the striking contrast between the two approaches to the cause of chemical disarmament. Hence the desire to either surround the Soviet initiatives with a curtain of silence or belittle the importance of these initiatives by means of all kind of diplomatic dodges, chicanery, and fabricated references to the allegedly "incomplete scope of the Soviet proposals that are said to fail to take into account all the aspects of the talks and by references to nonexistent "restrictive elements" in the USSR's approach to verification [kontrol].

However, none of Western diplomacy's maneuvers can disprove the obvious fact that the new Soviet initiatives gave a powerful impetus to the talks. This is precisely how the majority of the states represented at the talks assess the Soviet initiatives.

"If the United States and its allies are really interested in chemical disarmement," the Soviet Government statement notes, "then they must prove this by practical action at the negotiating table. Rather than initiating another round in the chemical arms rac. Now is the right time.

The West should have realized long ago that in our time it is not possible to ensure one's own security by means of an arms buildup, including a chemicao arms buildup. It is even more impossible to achiefe security at the expense of other people's security. Genuine security can only be achieved by political means on the basis of disarmament.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR LATE MAY COMMENTS ON NATO VOTE FOR CRISIS DEPLOYMENT

Italian Deputies Opposed

LD202025 Moscow TASS in English 1846 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] Rome, 20 May (TASS)--Left-wing independent deputies in the Italian Parliament have voiced serious concern over the dangerous plans of the United States to deploy binary weapons in Western Europe. In a document sent to the chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, the defense minister and minister of foreign affairs they noted the need to resist the militaristic plans of the American Administration. The deployment of American chemical weapons in Western Europe, the deputies stressed, contradicts the interests of Italy which has earlier undertaken not to produce chemical weapons and not to deploy them on its territory.

Danish Parliament Votes No

LD202345 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 20 May 86

[Text] Copenhagen, 20 May (TASS)--The Danish Parliament took by a majority vote a resolution calling on the government to declare at the coming meetings of the NATO governing bodies Denmark's negative attitude to the U.S. plans for producing and deploying the latest binary arms in Europe. Parliament also made it incumbent on the government to bring the Danish position to the attention of the U.S. Congress which stipulated appropriations for chemical weapons by the allies' approval of these plans at the NATO council's session. Parties of the government coalition obstained from voting.

NATO Military Group Discussion

LD212314 Moscow TASS in English 1354 GMT 21 May 86

[Text] Brussels, 21 May (TASS)--TASS correspondent Albert Balebanov reports:

The further buildup of NATO's arms arsenals are in the focus of attention of participants in a series of the spring sessions of the leading military bodies of the North Atlantic Alliance which began in the NATO headquarters today.

The two-day Atlantic meetings were opened with a session of the defense ministers Eurogroup, in which all the West European members of the alliance with the exception of France and Iceland participated. A meeting of the NATO military committee at the level of the chiefs-of-staff and heads of the national intelligence services will take place. The meetings in Brussels will culminate with a one-day session of the NATO Military Planning Committee at the defense ministers' level. The spring session of the NATO Council at the level of foreign ministers will be convened in Halifax, Canada, in late May.

According to the NOUVELLE ATLANTIQUE bulletin, the defense ministers will consider, first in the Eurogroup and then at the session of the NATO Military Planning Committee, various aspects of the implementation of a conventional arms modernization program for 1987-1992. They will review recommendations prepared in the course of recent meetings of the heads of national arms development agencies.

A discussion of the Pentagon's plans to start the large-scale production of chemical weapons of a new type, binary artillery shells and air bombs, which are going to be deployed in Western Europe, will have a special role to play at the meetings of the NATO ministers. The U.S. new dangerous plans have provoked worry and protests all over the world, especially in Europe. Broad sections of the West European public demand that their governments say no to Washington's new militarist venture.

The Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Greece, pressed by public opinion, took a negative stand on the U.S. chemical weapons plans. However, a session of the NATO Military Planning Committee at the level of permanent representatives here last week indicated that the other NATO partners had succumbed to the Pentagon's strong pressure and are backing its intentions.

The European "supplement" to the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" is another item on the agenda of the meetings of the NATO defense ministers. Local observers believe that the implementation of the "European Defense Initiative" will lead to the further escalation of the arms race.

Weinberger on European Worries

LD221928 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] New York, 22 May (TASS)--U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, giving an interview to the ABC TV company and touching on a meeting of the NATO defense ministers in Brussels, said that a number of participants in it had some reservations about the modernization of NATO's chemical arms arsenals. Weinberger had to admit that the current course of the U.S. and some of its allies worried the public in the West European countries.

FRG Defense Minister's Statement

LD222258 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 22 May (TASS)--TASS political news analyst Aleksey Grigoriyev writes:

It seems no chance that a dangerous decision of the NATO defense ministers in Brussels was announced by West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner. The Christian-Liberal Coalition, which is in power in West Germany, openly supports the U.S. plans to produce binary chemical weapons and, moreover, is prepared to accept in West German territory, following Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, binary artillery shells and Big Eye air bombs.

Manfred Woerner did not hide his satisfaction as he told a REUTERS correspondent even before the release of the official communique in the Belgian capital that the military ministers of the NATO countries had confirmed today the need to produce new-generation chemical weapons in the U.S. In this way one of the conditions set by American Congress for financing the Big Eye program was met. The other condition involves the drafting by Washington's West European partners of a special plan for the deployment of these weapons in the Old World.

Caspar Weinberger and Manfred Woerner thus have every reason to gloat. Yet is is too early to close the matter. The Europeans' resistance to the deployment of new-generation American chemical weapons, growing from one day to the next, is having an effect even on NATO. Reporting the address of the Bonn defense ministers to the journalists, the REUTERS correspondent stressed that the doubts and fears of some NATO allies have not been quenched and that the Netherlands, Norway and Denmark, for instance, did not mean support for the plan though they have accepted it.

Official spokesmen for the governments of those three countries have more than once publicly protested against the deployment of binary shells and bombs in their territories. As for West Germany, which the Pentagon has obviously cast in the role of the main depot for binary weapons, the pro-American course of the cabinet is strongly criticized by parliamentary opposition, the Social Democratic Party, and the Greens. Leading Social Democrat Egon Bahr, who recently participated in the drafting of a joint document of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Social Democratic Party of Germany, on establishing in Europe a chemical weapon-free zone, said that the decision to produce binary munitions was torpedoing the Geneva disarmament talks.

The USSR is known to have proposed a way of ridding the world of weapons of mass destruction, including chemical weapons, already by the end of this century and to have tabled practical initiatives to this effect at the Geneva disarmemtnt conference. Meanwhile, the U.S. backed by a number of its NATO partners, is stubbornly clearing the way for the latest chemical weapons into Europe. The conclusions from this comparison are obvious.

'Reservations' Stated

LD222036 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Burssels, 22 May (TASS)--TASS correspondent Albert Balevanov reports:

The intention of the NATO countries to intensify efforts to build up conventional arms arsenals was formulated in the final communique approved by the participants in the session of the NATO Military Planning committee here.

NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington said at a press conference that discussion of the Pentagon's plans to produce binary weapons, intended to be deployed in Western Europe, had been a special feature of the session, which had been attended by the defense ministers of 13 countries. West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner, who addressed the press conference, admitted that Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Greece and Luxembourg had reservations about the objections to those plans.

Iceland, which does not participate in the committee, also notified the allies of its disapproval of those U.S. plans through its permanent representative to NATO. However, the plan to "modernize American chemical weapons" was eventually approved under the strong pressure of the Pentagon Chief Caspar Weinberger.

The final communique of the session also says that Greece, Norway and Denmark stated their disagreement with the NATO position on nuclear and space weapons.

'Execution of Commands'

LD231818 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 23 May 86

[From "The Word Today" program presented by Vladimir Tsvetov]

[Text] In Brussels a 1-day session of the NATO Defense Planning Committee has been held. But there was no sign of planning at the session. Instead, the participants in the session were intensively engaged in drill, practicing execution of commands--Yes sir! It will be done! But it should be noted that not everyone followed the orders very readily. When U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger stated at the session the intention of the United States to produce binary gas designated for deployment in Western Europe, the representatives of Denmark, Norway, Holland, Greece, Luxembourg and Iceland opposed this. But finally everyone saluted and said "Yes Sir!"

Nor was there precision in the ranks of the participants in the session during discussion of issues connected with NATO strategy in the field of nuclear weapons and with the implementation of the U.S. "star wars" program. Greece, Norway and Denmark expressed disagreement with the NATO conception of nuclear and space weapons.

In the concluding communique of the session there is no mention of the proposals made by the USSR and other socialist countries for the banning of chemical weapons and their exclusion from the life of society. But one must suppose that the European participants in the session did not forget about the repeated warnings of the Soviet Union that the deployment of binary gas in Western Europe threatens to turn its densely populated areas into the potential theater of a destructive chemical war. For this very reason there was not complete obedience to Weinberger at the Brussels drill ground, that is, at the session of the NATO Defense Planning Committee. [video shows participants in session, including Weinberger and Lord Carrington]

Pentagon Pressures NATO

LD231727 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 23 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)--By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The United States allies are not at all enthusiastic about the prospect of the deployment in Western Europe of U.S. binary ammunition with nerve gas. In order to give the green light to new chemical armaments into the territory of its allies, the Pentagon has to resort not only to arm twisting with regard to high representatives of NATO countries but also to various not quite scrupulous ruses.

At a meeting of the NATO Military Planning Committee at the level of permanent representatives held at the headquarters in Brussels last week, the U.S. delegation suggested the endorsement of a long list of military equipment to be adopted to service in NATO in the years ahead. Several hundred items of armaments and military equipment included also new binary ammunition with nerve gas. On the basis of the approval of that list in principle by ambassadors Washington hastened to announce that all NATO countries declare for the production of chemical binary ammunition.

But at yesterday's meeting of the NATO Military Planning Council, the Netherlands Defense Minister Jacob de Ruiter described the U.S. methods of pushing through chemical weapons as inappropriate. Norwegian Minister Johan-Joergen Holst stated that his government does not see either moral or practical justification for the production of new chemical weapons by the United States. Among the 14 heads of the delegations, it is only the defense ministers of the FRG, Britain and Canada that supported Caspar Weinberger on the matter. The other ministers either openly criticized the plans of the creation of new U.S. chemical weapons or expressed doubts about the need to modernize the NATO arsenals of chemical warfare agents.

The final communique of the session of the defense ministers of NATO countries whose main aim was to discuss Washington's plans with regard to chemical weapons does not make any mention of the allies consent to the production of binary ammunition in the United States.

Meanwhile, the Pentagon needs this consent for starting the production of new chemical weapons at the plants that have already been built in Pine Bluff and other cities in the U.S. The point of the matter is that the U.S. Congress adopted last year the decision to appropriate the funds for the manufacture of binary ammunition only if its production is approved by the European allies.

In this situation Caspar Weinberger has again decided to push his way through. Disregarding the stand of NATO allies, the head of the U.S. military department announced that all the conditions advanced by the Congress had allegedly been met and the Pentagon can embark on the production of new armaments now.

It is difficult to say what will be the reaction of the U.S. Congress to this "bold" interpretation of the actual stand of European NATO countries on chemical weapons by the Pentagon. Washington's ability to prevail upon its partners in the military bloc and to deploy its poisonous "gifts" in Western Europe should not be underestimated, though.

The session of the NATO Military Planning Council in Brussels clearly showed how disgusted people are with horrible chemical weapons. The Pentagon's plans to turn Europe into a gas chamber evoke stormy protests all over the world. The leaders of NATO countries have to take them into consideration in some other measure. Not so members of the U.S. Administration, FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

The future will show if the apologists of senseless military concepts of supplementing nuclear weapons with chemical ones gain the upper hand in NATO or if common sense still prevails.

Commentary on 'Morality'

LD232047 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 May 86

[Political observer Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] The NATO Military Planning Committee, at its regular session, approved a plan to produce new chemical weapons in the United States. Here is the latest news commentary from our political observer Aleksandr Zholkver:

I think that there is no need to spend a long time in proving that the decision to produce a new type of chemical weapon--the so-called binary one, which consists of two components which, as a result of an explosion,

form a nerve-paralyzing mixture--signifies a dangerous new turn in the arms race. I would like to draw your attention not so much to the military-technological aspect of the NATO decision, as the moral one.

Remember how many fine words were uttered in the Atlantic capitals, in Washington first and foremost, about humanitarianism, about the necessity to protect man and nature, after the accident in Chernobyl. And what are the United States and NATO's specific actions? Following another nuclear blast in Nevada--the production of new and even more refined types of poisonous chemical agent--is that humanitarianism, or is it cynicism? I will note that even the governments of a number of NATO countries consider the situation whereby West Europe is becoming a kind of double hostage of the United States--nuclear as well as chemical--as being an odious one.

It is not fortuitous that almost half of the United States NATO allies--6 out of 13--have spoken out against the plans for chemical modernization. And, all the same, these plans were adopted under Washington's pressure, but look at the reasoning for them: those countries where there are already stocks of U.S. chemical weapons--that is Britain and the FRG first and foremost--are being promised the removal of the old stocks, and the introduction of new ones, allegedly, only in crisis situation conditions.

Well, first of all, even now, many eminent politicians in these countries, for example, experts from the Social Democratic Party of Germany, are warning that it is more likely that the new examples of U.S. chemical bombs and shells will be simply added to the old ones. And secondly, as regards the crisis situation, as is known, it is being created by Washington itself, without asking its allies' consent. This was the case, for example, with the U.S. Air Force and Navy's use of NATO bases in Britain and Italy during the aggression against Libya. And now, the U.S. assistant secretary of defense says straightforwardly: We do not intend to give the right of a veto in relation to U.S. binary weapons programs to any country whatsoever. Such as the Pentagon's "pearls," in every sense of the word.

And finally, another of Washington's arguments, if one may call it that, in favor of chemical weapons. The more there is of it, and the more lethal it is, the quicker, allegedly, it will be possible to reach an agreement with the Russians on banning it. But, after all, that is the same as proposing to put out a fire with petrol. As regards our country, in contrast to the morality of the admirers of the silent death, we have proposed an absolutely specific plan for a total ban on the production and the destruction of all chemical weapons stocks before the end of the present century.

Reasons for U.S. 'Hurry'

LD241222 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 May 86

[Interview with TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev by Moscow Radio observer Vladislav Kozyakov]

[Excerpts] [Kozyakov] Our guest today is Vladimir Bogachev, a TASS observer on military affairs. We have invited him to our studio to discuss various aspects of the chemical weapons problem. According to press reports from Brussels, Belgium, the majority of the NATO Defense Ministers have just adopted the United States' plan to produce a new generation of chemical weapons. Why have they chosen this spring for that, Vladimir?

[Bogachev] It looks like that in the face of the growing opposition to the American plans of deploying chemical weapons in Western Europe Washington has decided to resort to tactics of creating chemical weapons, creating into Europe [sentence as heard]. They have obviously decided to fry a chemical pie for Europeans on a slow fire. In the first place they have promised now that they are going to remove all the arsenals of chemical weapons from Europe. Then they decided to deploy new binary weapons in Europe. But they said they are going to do that only in crisis situations. I don't think this is a real state of affairs; I don't think they are going to follow these, you know, principles they have promised to Europeans. All these considerations are designed for simpletons, I think. For sure. They have finished their plant in Pine Bluff which is going to produce binary weapons; they are going to get more money from the Congress and that's why they are in such a hurry.

[Kozyakov] How could you explain such a situation: the United States Administration has not yet responded to the new Soviet proposals on chemical disarmament put forward at the Geneva disarmament conference. Instead it urges to start the binary weapon production. Why?

[Bogachev] I think in this case Washington is following the same pattern which they stick to in other fields of arms control. They say that the best results in the reduction of chemical weapons, in the annihilation of chemical weapons, could be achieved by first increasing American arsenals. This is a very bad logic, I would say, if you could call it logic at all.

[Kozyakov] The United States Administration spokesmen say that the production of the binary weapons would stimulate the current talks on chemical disarmament. What would you say about this?

[Bogachev] This is just another example of the tactics of the American side at negotiations. They would always say that the best, the shortest cut to disarmament lies through building up more arms. Our position is absolutely different.

[Kozyakov] Well, Vladimir, is there any chance, in your view, to come to terms at the Geneva disarmament conference in this particular field, chemical disarmament?

[Bogachev] The latest Soviet proposals, I mean the new approaches, new, fresh approaches to the problem of chemical disarmament, makes me a big optimistic, frankly. These proposals, I mean specially verification problems, the problems of destroying chemical bases for chemical weapons, open up new perspectives to eliminate chemical weapons once and for ever and I think reason will prevail.

Pentagon 'Chemical Trap'

LD240842 Moscow TASS in English 0817 GMT 24 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 24 May (TASS)--Vladislav Drobkov, commenting on the NATO military bodies' session which has come to a close in Brussels, writes in today's PRAVDA: "The defense ministers' endorsement of the program for the production of binary munitions in the United States has been the chief and the most ominous outcome of the Brussels session. This new chemical weapon is to take the place of the old arsenals of toxic agents that are now in service with the North Atlantic bloc. It will be produced in the United States and is to be used--in the European continent. Having secured NATO's consent to the start of the production of the new type of weapons of mass destruction and also to the possibility of bringing it to and using on European soil, Washington has won yet another 'victory' over its own allies. Having become the nuclear hostages of the U.S. as a result of the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe, the allies also get into the chemical trap of the "Pentagon".

As is justly pointed out even by many western analysts, U.S. promises that the binary death would be brought to Europe only in the event of a "crisis situation" are not worth a rap, PRAVDA writes. U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle let it out recently that it is impossible to determine what a crisis is. In other words, it would be only Washington that will determine when and where the new weapons should be deployed or used.

"It is not fortuitous that the escalation of chemical arms has now given rise to a wave of indignation and protests in Western Europe. The governments of Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Greece, Luxembourg, and Iceland have made reservations and raised objections to the U.S. plans. However, (and this is a highly significant example of the 'equality' reigning in NATO), the opinion of the junior partners was grossly disregarded under the pressure of the U.S. and of its most militant allies".

PRAVDA also points out that the constructive Soviet peace initiatives were simply passed over in silence at the session.

Commentary on European Opposition

LD242220 Moscow International Service in Italian 1900 GMT 24 May 86

[Station commentary by Nikolay Gratisnov]

[Text] In Brussels, on Thursday, duri g a session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Session, an American plan for the production of a new chemical weapon of the binary type was approved. In this connection, our commentator Nikolay Gratsianov writes:

The resolution of the ministers of defense of the NATO countries, which opened the door to this new type of weapon of mass extermination, was received in Washington with understandable satisfaction. The State Department hastened to declare that the resolution was passed by a majority vote.

However, it does not seem that such optimism is justified in this case. AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE, in point of fact, has reported that approval was not accompanied by any enthusiasm. Several West European ministers did not limit themselves to expressing their reservations but also declared themselves decisively against the resolution to produce binary weapons destined to be stored in Europe close to the lines of demarcation with the countries of the socialist community. Among these were the representatives of the Netherlands, Denmark, Greece and Luxembourg. The Netherlands Minister of Defense Jacob de Ruiter, in his statement at a press conference in Brussels, accused Defense Secretary Weinberger of wishing to conceal the truth as to the true attitude of the allies toward the American plan.

A series of countries including the Netherlands, the minister said, had declared, without leaving any room for doubt, that they absolutely cannot approve the installation in Europe of this new type of chemical weapon planned by the United States.

The proof of Denmark's position is the resolution approved by its Parliament on the eve of the meeting of the NATO Military Planning Committee which reiterates in particular the contrary opinion of Parliament to the production of the new chemical weapon and its installation in Denmark.

However, this and other contrary voices were not taken into consideration. As usual, the lead was taken by the United States and their old European partners--Federal Germany and Great Britain--which have now taken on the role of propagandists for the Pentagon.

NATO in short, has once again placed American interests above the national interests of the countries of Western Europe. In addition to the nuclear challenge, reinforced following the appearance on the continent of American medium-range missiles, a new threat now hangs over Europe, that of binary weapons.

In this way we now run the danger of transforming Europe into a potential theater for a destructive chemical war, the principal victim of which would be primarily the civilian population.

As though acknowledging the unpopularity of the resolution adopted and in an attempt to sweeten the pill, the participants at the meeting of the NATO Military Planning Committee addressed to the Soviet Union a communique containing an appeal to take up a more constructive position in the negotiations aimed at banning chemical weapons throughout the entire planet.

This appeal sounds like pure political demagogy. There is no need at all, in point of fact, to invite the USSR to take up a position on which it has always insisted. The USSR, within the framework of international organizations and bilateral contacts with the United States, has more than once expounded its concrete program of chemical disarmament, to be implemented under a serious and efficacious control also by international organs. The last time that the Soviet Union advanced its program was one month ago at the Geneva disarmament conference, reconfirming in that venue its principal objective, the complete liquidation of chemical weapons and the industrial facilities for their production.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union expresses itself in favor of the adoption of intermediate measures, one of which could be the elimination of chemical weapons from the European continent.

Against the background of such initiatives, NATO's consent to the starting up of American production of a new generation of destructive weapons can be considered only as an attempt to further obstruct the achieving of an international understanding on banning chemical weapons. Such a consent is in clear contrast with the statements in favor of a world with fewer weapons issued by those leaders of the Western countries who, at Brussels, approved Washington's plan.

Congressional Criticism Cited

LD242310 Moscow TASS in English 2249 GMT 24 May 86

[Text] Washington, 24 May (TASS)--The U.S. Administration's dangerous plans to start the production of binary chemicals, new barbarous types of weapons of mass destruction, are criticized in Congress.

Dante Fascell, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, said that he would lead the struggle for removing from the budget appropriations for the production of new-generation chemical weapons. He accused the administration of an attempt to carry out that new militarist program in circumvention of congressional restructions. Similar charges were made in a letter to President Ronald Reagan by a group of members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations led by Committee Chairman Mark Hatfield.

Seeking to impose new chemical weapons on its allies, Washington practices political maneuvers. To secure support from West Germany, the administration, according to Fascell, decided to conclude with Bonn a secret deal envisioning the shipment of new weapons to Western Europe with Bonn's consent in a "crisis situation."

U.S. 'Distorted Logic'

LD251843 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 May 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Reagan's "star wars" plans just cannot be accommodated into the process of arms limitation, but Washington is endeavoring to impose on its partners its distorted logic, according to which the stockpiling of military arsenals leads to their reduction, and the creation of new types of armaments will allegedly reduce the danger of war.

This undignified mission has again been undertaken by Weinberger, who has arrived in Brussels to take part in a NATO Military Planning Committee session. His aim was to get from the allies approval for plans to deploy new U.S. chemical weapons--binary ammunition--in Western Europe. The fact is, U.S. Congress agreed to allocate funds to the production of a new generation of toxins only on condition that U.S. NATO partners would consent to deploy them on their territory.

Earlier, the FRG Government had given its consent to accept the binary charges, but it tired to mask this decision with a number of formal reservations: That the U.S. military chemical agents now in Western Germany should be removed by 1992, and the new combat toxins be deployed only in a crisis situation and with the consent of the Bonn Government. These reservations were obviously made only to pacify the public. The bases for stockpiling binary weapons in the FRG have already been allocated, and as for the so-called crisis situation, creating one constitutes no difficulty for Washington; it is sufficient to organize another attack like the raid on Libya.

Not surprisingly Washington's plans have provoked protests, both in the FRG and in other West European countries, and the governments of these countries have to reckon with this.

'Hypocritical Phrases' on Peace

LD251859 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 May 86

[Kipras Mazheyka report from the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The meetings held on Leopold III Avenue are not called the Atlantic marathons for nothing. [video shows exterior of NATO building in Brussels,

still of NATO conference] For a month, heads of war departments of NATO countries, chiefs of general staff, intelligence chiefs, and nuclear planning experts have held a sort of relay race. The marathon ends with a NATO Council session at the level of foreign ministers. This time the last lap will take place on 30 May quite a long way from the starting point--in Halifax, Canada. Perhaps this is the only novelty to date in the code of tradition, which is usually held sacred here. [as heard]

The numerous journalists accredited to NATO Headquarters were not, however, interested in that aspect. Would there be a reply to the new concrete initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union; from the platform of the 11th SED Congress in Berlin; and in the recent speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on Soviet television? This is primarily what my colleagues from various countries were awaiting, without leaving their desks at the press center. [video shows jouranlists at press center] Inevitably, were that to happen, and could not happen, for the simple reason that our opponents in the West are simply not ready for the equitable measures proposed by the USSR on halting the nuclear arms race, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons, and guaranteeing security in Europe. [video shows Weinberger on platform]

Even the local bourgeois newspapers, which are not sympathetic to us, could not conceal their indignation at the fact that following the extension of the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear tests until 6 August, another explosion thundered at the Nevada nuclear testing ground. [video shows French-language newspaper on chemical weapons] And it is not indicative that neither during the press conference given by Lord Carrington, NATO general secretary, nor that of Pentagon Chief Weinberger, was there the slightest hint of readiness to respond in any way to the Soviet peace proposals or to embark on serious talks? [video shows Lord Carrington speaking]

The NATO chiefs created a false impression that the peace proposals did not exist, but as ever there were many unproven and false words about the growing Soviet military might. The resolution adopted at the Euro-group session stresses the need to perfect modern technology for the creation of new, more effective types of conventional weapons, and to expand cooperation in this field among the European partners. The final documents of this Military Committee session are also stepped in the theses of the notorious Soviet threat. [video shows Mazhayka in street] The communique of this Atlantists' rally is literally filled with hypocritical phrases of NATO's adherence to the cause of preserving peace. And at the same time the participants in the alliance stress their readiness to implement a strategy of deterrence, coordinated by the bloc, to continue the planned deployment in "Eastern Europe of U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles, and to work for an increase in real military expenditure."

A special feature of the present spring session of the leading bodies of NATO was wide discussion of the U.S. plans for modernization of its arsenals of chemical weapons. This further militaristic venture the Pentagon is

trying to drag its West European allies into, envisages production--across the Atlantic--of binary ammunition filled with lethal nerve paralysis gas. This will be stockpiled in Western Europe in the event of a so-called crisis situation. [video shows exercises using chemical weapons]

The plan devized by the U.S. military for chemical rearmament was actively supported at the North Atlantic bloc headquarters and primarily by its general secretary, Carrington, and by General Rogers, Supreme Commander of NATO Joint Forces in Western Europe. But the new design of the militarists has created serious differences among the allies in the bloc. According to leaked information, the transformation of Western Europe into a bridgehead for chemical warfare was opposed at Evere by the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway and Greece. It was not by accident that Carrington, on the eve of the start of the Atlantic marathon, made an urgent trip to Copenhagen and Athens. This circumstance was pointed out by observers here. Numerous press commentaries stress that implementation of NATO's sinister new program, threatens to turn thickly populated territories of ths planet into a potential theater of exterminatory chemical warfare, of which the main victims will be the civilian population of Europe.

Risks to Civilians Stressed

LD262222 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 26 May 86

[Commentary by observer Nikolay Borin]

[Text] Last week NATO's Military Planning Committee approved Washington's dangerous plan for building a new generation of chemical weapons known as binary. This decision is tantamount to consent to their deployment in Western Europe. Our observer Nikolay Borin is here with me in the studio.

[Borin] Being extremely unpopular in Europe, this decision was the result of intensive pressure brought to bear on the allies by the Reagan administration. It's noteworthy that the pressure was not only political. In the week preceding the NATO session Western Europe experienced another onslaught of American advertisement, and this time advertisement involved chemical arms, a clean and safe weapon that kills quickly and quietly with one short sniff and yet, according to Pentagon officials, overcomes the problem of how to handle and store such lethal products safely. But the advertisement reflected a lot of desire to market the goods and very little truth. The depots of binary weapons are potential objectives of retaliatory strikes and even an accidental hit or a technical mishap might lead to mixing the components of poisonous chemicals, and then one short sniff will be sufficient indeed. But even when the weapon is used in combat the deadly sniff can be made not necessarily by the enemy, because a binary shell is effective within a short radius, [word indistinct] miles only. And in terms of time, however, it is effective for several hours, and the VX killer agent in the Big Eye bomb can last for more than a week and even longer. According to some estimates, in case of a conflict with the use of chemical arms the casualty ratio between the troops and civilians

would be 1 to 20. So the new generation of chemical weapons is capable of turning densely populated Europe into a contaminated desert. Certainly the generals as a rule have something consoling to say. This situation will last only until the arrival of fresh NATO troops, largely from the U.S. WHO will wait until the winds dispel the poisonous gas, they say. By the way, such statements, I think reveal the strategic schemes of the Pentagon in the issue of siting binary weapons in Europe. Evidently the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway realize the meaning of that strategy which made them take a special stand at NATO's committee for military planning.

[Unidentified announcer] THE TIMES has said that the United States will undoubtedly use chemical weapons in a European and not in an intercontinental war. So if the United States uses binary weapons in Europe, the following question will arise: To what extent will NATO's European members have control over the use of such weapons?

[Borin] To a minimum extent, I am afraid. American Assistant Defense Secretary Richard Perle expressed the American stand on this issue with utmost clarity. The United States, he declared, will use its Armed Forces without consultation with the allies even if these forces are stationed at bases abroad. And let's recall the [word indistinct] battle doctrine which NATO adopted for the vigorous efforts of American General Bernard Rogers, who is the supreme allied commander in Europe. The doctrine provides for using chemical arms in Europe as first-strike weapons along with nuclear arms. It is common knowledge that Pershings and cruise missiles are in care of the American military. As for binary weapons, which will be manufactured at Pine Bluff in the United States and meant for use in offensive operations in Europe, they will undoubtedly be in the Pentagon's control too.

[Announcer] In Brussels NATO obtained consent of the production of binary weapons, thus meeting one of the congressional conditions; and the other condition is that Congress will approve allocations for the production of binary weapons if the great powers fail to reach an agreement on banning all chemical arms. So does, in your view, Washington intend to take steps in this direction?

[Borin] I think if a government really intends to seek to ban some weaponry, it would hardly be engaged in building up its production. On 22 April Moscow advanced proposals aimed at eliminating the current contradictions at the talks on prohibiting chemical arms. These proposals provide for substantially expanding verification measures. They include international on-site inspection over the scrapping of plants making chemical weapons. By the way, a major reason for the promotion of binary weapons in the United States is the striving to ensure maximum secrecy in the production, transportation, and storage of poisonous chemicals. The simplicity of making binary ammunition makes it possible, according to Western chemists, to easily adjust civilian chemical plants to their production. This will allow for sharply increasing the volume of unaccounted produce. [as heard] Chemical arms are the world's first weapons of mass destruction. They were tested

in battles in Europe during World War I. It is easy to understand the impatience to let the genie out of the bottle felt by the U.S. military, who have been working on it for 20 years. But it is really hard to understand the haste displayed by some of the allies in giving consent to the deployment of this dangerous type of weaponry in Europe.

Pentagon's Plan Said 'Almost Complete'

LD272001 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 27 May 86

[Text] Washington, 27 May (TASS)--The Pentagon has almost completed the planning on how to get the so-called binary chemical munitions, a new generation of barbaric chemical weapons, to Europe. Thomas Welch, a high-ranking official of the U.S. Department of Defense, responsible for the development of chemical weapons, said in an interview with the newspaper WASHINGTON POST that "planning for the new binary nerve gas weapons is being done by the joint chiefs of staff and will be complete in June, next month."

Soviet Proposals Recalled

LD311930 Moscow TASS in English 1843 GMT 31 May 86

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (TASS)--TASS news analyst Ivan Ablamov writes:

The Soviet Union has again strongly called for the total prohibition and unconditional elimination of chemical weapons under verifiable international accords. This is stressed forcefully anew in the Soviet Government's statement on this matter of utmost urgency for mankind.

The latest Soviet appeal has been prompted by dangerous developments. Against the background of statements for chemical disarmament, arms limitations and the buildup of international trust, the military forces in NATO took decisions in the past few days to sanction the production in the U.S. of new-generation chemical weapons which are even more fearsome than their precedessors, binary weapons. These decisions escalate the chemical threat to mankind, work against the task of eliminating chemical weapons and contradict the Soviet-American accords achieved at the Geneva summit.

The consequences of NATO's chemical rearmament are especially pernicious to Europe, which is oversaturated with deadly weapons of every type as it is. There is just one step from the beginning of the production of binary weapons by the U.S. to their deployment in the territories of the West European NATO countries. It would be naive to think that the U.S. will merely stockpile chemical munitions in its own territory, that is, where the Pentagon does not plan to use them.

To all appearances, this is well understood in Western Europe and in other parts of the world. Small wonder that notable politicians in West Germany, Britain and other West European countries are criticizing the plans to deploy additional American chemical weapons in the continent and that the West European public is saying no to binary or any other chemical weapons.

The world, worried by the militarist plans of Washington and NATO, is speaking highly of the very different and unconditional position of the Soviet Union, which stands for a total ban on and the elimination of chemical weapons. The latest Soviet proposal on this matter, formulated by Mikhail Gorbachev in his statement of 15 January this year and subsequently tabled at the disarmament conference, makes it possible completely to eliminate the chemical arms arsenals and the very industrial base for their production by the end of this century. Strict control, including international on-site inspections, could be established over the entire process of chemical disarmament. These proposals take account of the positions of many other countries, including the U.S. and, in view of virtually all the participants in the talks on drafting an international convention to ban chemical weapons, make it possible to overcome a number of situations which have seemed deadlocked, including those concerning verification.

The Soviet Union stands for more intensive efforts to draw up such a convention, which has been urged by the UN General Assembly on more than one occasion and which was agreed by the leaders of the USSR and the U.S. in Geneva last November.

The Soviet Union also supports proposals on establishing as an intermediate step zones free from chemical weapons in central Europe and in the Balkans and is prepared to guarantee their status if the U.S. does the same. The USSR together with its allies has called for completely ridding Europe of chemical weapons. It has always strictly followed the principle of non-transfer of chemical weapons to any party and their non-deployment in the territories of other states.

The Soviet Union is again drawing the attention of the governments of the U.S. and other NATO countries, of all the European states to the exceptional danger of NATO's plans for the cause of peace in Europe and all over the world. It is again showing goodwill and proposing practical ways of reaching political solutions on the basis of a mutually acceptable and effectively verifiable accord on the problem of chemical disarmament in the belief that reason should triumph over chemical madness. The ball is now in the western court.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS ON BELGIAN PARLIAMENT'S VOTE AGAINST CW DEPLOYMENT

'Clear Warning' to U.S.

LD051931 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 5 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The Chamber of Representatives of the Belgian parliament adopted on Wednesday the decision against the deployment of chemical weapons on the country's territory. This decision is an act of political importance that is not limited to Belgium alone. The decision draws attention again to the extreme dangerousness of the production in the United States of new, even more horrible types of weapons of mass destruction -- binary charges -- and their deployment in Western Europe. The production of such weapons has been sanctioned by NATO. The results of the voting in the Belgian parliament also showed again that ever wider public circles declare against binary weapons and that the NATO decision has been imposed by Washington against the will of the legislative bodies of such countries, as The Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and others, and, surely, against the will of peoples.

NATO's programme of chemical rearmament worked out in the Pentagon is largely similar to so-called "rearming" with nuclear-missile weapons, as a result of which a number of West European countries have been turned into a launch pad for U.S. "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles. And the very script on which U.S. binary weapons are to be deployed in Western Europe is similar to the one in accordance with which the missiles were deployed. It should be noted, that according to the U.S. military doctrine, chemical weapons are first-strike weapons, too.

It is easy to see with what grave consequences for European and universal security this course of the Pentagon and the NATO headquarters is fraught. The deployment of U.S. binary weapons in Western Europe threatens to turn so densely populated areas into a potential theater of devastative chemical war. And the civilian population would become the main victim. It is absolutely vulnerable to this horrible weapon of mass destruction.

The resolution adopted by Belgian parliamentarians emphasises that Belgium must say clearly to its partners in NATO that it is utterly against binary weapons or any other chemical weapons. This refers both to the deployment of such weapons on Belgian territory and to equipping Belgian forces with such weapons. This is a clear warning to Washington and those NATO circles that strive to embark on a new extremely dangerous spiral of the chemical weapons race. This decision of the lower chamber of the Belgian parliament shows that the Belgian deputies are aware of the seriousness of the time when the question if there should be or shouldn't be chemical disarmament is posed most acutely.

The Soviet Union's answer to this question has always been unambiguous. In its recent statement to this effect, the Soviet Government emphasised again that chemical weapons should be fully banned and unconditionally destroyed. The Soviet Union proposes to establish strict control, including international on-site inspection, over the entire process of chemical disarmament. The course at insane spiralling of chemical weapons race, which is the only way to describe NATO's decision on binary weapons is opposed by the Soviet Union with concrete realistic proposals that ensure ultimately complete elimination of chemical arsenals and of the industrial base for their production.

West European Split

LD112331 Moscow TASS in English 1806 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS -- TASS News Analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

As the Belgian press reported, the Belgian Government has instructed its permanent representative at the NATO headquarters to officially inform the leadership of the NATO alliance, as well as all NATO member countries of Belgium's stand on the question of chemical weapons, set out in the resolution of the Chamber of Representatives of the Belgian parliament of June 4 of this year. The resolution prohibits the deployment of chemical weapons on Belgian territory under any circumstances. The Belgian parliamentarians at the same time demanded that Wildfried Martens' government should press for the conlcusion of an international agreement on the complete ban on the production and use of chemical weapons.

This decision, undoubtedly, reflects in certain measure the growing concern of Western Europeans over the recent sanctioning by the NATO military bodies of the start of the production of the new generation of chemical weapons in the USA, binary weapons, meant for the deployment and use in warfare in Western Europe.

It should be recalled that at the Brussels session of the NATO military bodies late in May, Washington brought pressure on its allies and managed to get their consent to the production by the Pentagon of binary weapons with nerve gas. And the permission of the U.S. Congress to the government to start the production of one of the most horrible types of weapons of mass destruction hinged on that consent. Not all of the United States allies in NATO agreed to Washington's demand, but the U.S. Government ignored their opinion in order to embark on the production of chemical weapons meant for Europe.

Though some of the United States' closest allies, among them Bonn, say that binary weapon will be deployed only in "crisis situation", the question of bringing binary charges to Western Europe and the schedule of their delivery will be decided in Washington, not in other NATO capital. So another U.S. weapon of mass destruction is added to lethal armaments of various kinds with which Europe is already inundated. The U.S. Administration is least of all concerned over the menace that chemical weapons deployed in West European countries pose for their population. Washington has already imposed on Europe "Pershing-2" missiles and cruise missiles. And it was guided in this by its own globalist ambitions, not by security of West European peoples.

No reasoning can justify the build-up of every new kinds of arms in a densely populated region, such as Europe, particularly at the time when the peace forces are conducting an intensive quest for the ways of an early ridding of the continent of the most destructive weapon systems. Leaders in many NATO capitals talk about the striving for disarmament, for the easing of East-West tension. But in reality they join in new U.S. plans of arms build-up, including the militarisation of outer space. Acting in this way these leaders first of all deceive themselves and the public of their countries. The NATO circles assure everybody that they adhere to disarmament while, at the same time, they embark on a new spiral of the arms race, the nuclear and chemical weapons race.

The USSR and its allies declare for ridding Europe of nuclear and chemical weapons of annihilation by the end of this century. They demand the elimination of these weapons, not their build-up. And if the United States and its partners in NATO are really interested in chemical disarmament, they must confirm this by practical deeds, at the negotiating table. The Soviet Union has long been inviting them to such talks.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: FRG SPD ASSAILS GOVERNMENT ON CW DEPLOYMENT

Issues Statement

LD281148 Moscow TASS in English 0919 GMT 28 May 86

[Text] Bonn May 28 TASS — The West German Social Democrats are opposed to the deployment of new chemical weapons on the territory of their country, the Presidium of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SDP] stressed in a statement released here.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, the document runs, claims that its consent is needed for the deployment of these dangerous weapons on the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany in a crisis situation, that the new binary chemical weapons of the USA will not be deployed in the FRG in peacetime. Such statements are absolutely untrue. The SPD strongly demands that the arms race be stopped. Social Democrats think that the FRG Government and other governments of NATO member countries should renounce the deployment of chemical weapons in Western Europe not only in peacetime but also in the event of what they term "a crisis situation".

Stressing the need for the complete prohibition of chemical weapons, the SPD Presidium states that the creation in Europe of a zone free from chemical weapons will become a precondition for ridding mankind from chemical threat.

Kohl 'Deluding Public'

LD222155 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Bonn, 22 May (TASS)—By TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy:

Chancellor Helmut Kohl's government is deluding the West German public by asserting that the deployment of new American chemical weapons in the country will be carried out only on the emergence of a "crisis situation" and only with consent from the West German Government, Karsten-Dietrich Voigt, a prominent figure in the Social Democratic Party (SPD) and expert of the party parliamentary faction on foreign policy matters, has declared in Bonn.

In fact, he said, the West German Government bodies, closely cooperating with the U.S. Defense Department, were not working out plans for the shipment of binary weapons and their deployment on West German territory.

According to available information, Voigt emphasized, the U.S. was going to place in West Germany 760,000 chemical grenades--far more than the initially announced 460,000.

The parliamentarian said that even if the U.S. withdrew from West Germany some of its outdated chemical munitions, with their storing becoming dangerous, the overall number of U.S. chemical weapons would become even bigger.

Besides, the Americans were not going to await any consent from the West German Government for the deployment of new chemical munitions.

Voigt doubted that the West German Government would at all be able to adopt a decision rejecting the deployment of new American chemical weapons on its territory. This idea was confirmed by American Congressman John Porter in an interview with the Social Democratic Weekly VORWAERTS.

In order to start the production of new-generation chemical weapons in the U.S., he said, it was sufficient to secure consent of the U.S. NATO allies. But when the U.S. started the production of binary weapons, the pressure on the Allies would become so strong as to comple them to agree to their deployment on their territory. This would concern above all West Germany, Porter pointed out.

The leadership of the Greens party demanded that the West German Government prevent the deployment of new U.S. binary weapons on West German territory.

The U.S. intention to start the production of binary munitions showed that the U.S., ignoring world public opinion, was seeking to launch a new round of the arms race.

Bonn should not become an accomplice in that extremely dangerous policy, said the party's statement. It should reject both the planned production of binary weapons and their deployment on West German territory, and demand that the U.S. withdraw all its chemical munitions stored in the country.

Foreign Policy Expert

LD220818 Moscow TASS in English 0631 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] Bonn, 22 May (TASS)--Karsten Dietrich Voigt, a foreign policy expert of the SDPG group in the West German Bundestag, accused the country's government of misleading the public by its claims that new U.S. binary chemical weapons would be deployed in the FRG only in an emergency situation and with an agreement of the FRG's Government. According to Voigt's statement, the U.S. has drafted a plan for delivering and deploying in the FRG 460,000 chemical grenades with new chemical agents and, in an emergency situation, will not wait for a decision of the FRG's Government

on delivering them to the Federal Republic. Voigt expressed doubt that the FRG's Government had any chance and would be able to take a decision on refusing to deploy new chemical weapons in the FRG. He demanded that the government should not agree to deploying new U.S. chemical weapons in the FRG under any circumstances.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET ENVOY TO BONN: CW TREATY 'ABOUT TO BE CONCLUDED'

LD121301 Hamburg DPA in German 1220 GMT 12 Jun 86

[Text] Bonn, 12 Jun (DPA) -- A treaty on the worldwide ban on chemical weapons is "about to be concluded," according to Soviet Ambassador in Bonn Yuliy Kvitsinskiy. Speaking today at a peace movement disarmament hearing, Kvitsinskiy said that only "question of secondary importance" have to be resolved at the Geneva [word indistinct] disarmament committee, but the West is giving them unwarranted importance. Taking part at the event in the Saarland regional office, which was organized by the Peace Movement Coordinating Committee, were, among others, Munich physics Prof H.P. Duerr, and Mainz mineralogist Prof Werner Dosch; U.S. Ambassador Richard Burt was invited but did not attend.

Kvitsinskiy was unwilling to answer Dosch's question on whether the Soviet Union would renounce chemical weapons unilaterally and thus set an example, as with the nuclear test moratorium. His country had faced too many negative experiences concerning unilateral disarmament. The ambassador avoided a question on the degree of Soviet SDI research by assuring that the Soviet Union is keeping to the research limits imposed by the ABM Treaty.

Kvitsinskiy, who worked in Geneva for many years as one of the Soviet Union's most experienced disarmament negotiators, said that the West is incapable of disarmament. The claim that at the negotiating table Soviet negotiators are unable to transform the public offers of their general secretary into deeds, is a "fairy tale." U.S. President Reagan's statements at last night's press conference on Soviet SALT II violations were all "untenable."

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW ON UK AGREEMENT FOR STATIONING U.S. BINARY ARMS

Role in Air-Land Battle

LD222343 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 22 May 86

[Text] John Stanley, the British minister of state for the Armed Forces, declared recently that the new American binary chemical weapons could be deployed in Britain. We asked Konstantin Sorokin, a military and political analyst, to assess the likely implications of this statement. We bring you the interview in English transcript, and to begin with: Was it an out-of-the-blue announcement?

[Sorokin] Not at all. Some five years ago, when Washington was about to proclaim its chemical rearmament program, there were persistent rumors that the Americans were sounding out London's view on stationing the proposed binary weapons in Britain. At that time British officials catagorically denied that any approach on this score had been made. For several years after that, the cabinet was evasive on the issue, but there were indications that its members were engaged in extensive debates on what the future British chemical strategy should be. Where these deliberations were actually heading was disclosed by the then defense secretary, Michael Heseltine. Last summer he remarked during the question time in parliament that it would be logical to see the new American chemical weapons in Britain.

[Announcer] And what weapons could actually be deployed in Britain?

[Sorokin] The chief contenders are the Bigeye binary bombs for the British based American F-111 fighter-bombers and possibly chemically tipped cruise missiles.

[Announcer] The Americans claim these will be safe in storage and will present no danger to the local population.

[Korokin] Well, it's not as simple as that. The unitary ammunition in American arsenals gives rise to over 1,000 leaks a year due to corrosion from inside. True, the two binary components individually are less aggressive substances, but they are by no means neutral either. Plus, binary warheads in general have a rather complex and thus fragile structure, so in their case accidents cannot be ruled out.

[Announcer] So where does the danger with the binary scheme lie for Britain?

[Sorokin] The scheme is tailored to the American air-land battle concepts and the NATO Rogers plan. Both envisage highly offensive actions by NATO troops with the use of both chemical and nuclear weapons at an early stage. The initial strikes are supposed to be deep, up to 1,000 km. The two long-range binary weapons for Britain that I mentioned also indicate that strikes from the American bases in the United Kingdom are planned to be deep.

[Announcer] This means that Britain, in conceeding to the binary scheme, is giving a boost to the American plan aiming to stage a devastating combined conventional-chemical-nuclear war in Europe?

[Sorokin] Yes, and Britain stands to lose a lot, if not everything, in such a war because chemical as well as nuclear strikes from British soil will most certainly entail counter blows.

[Announcer] But how real is the possibility of binary weapons being stored in Britain?

[Sorokin] It is very real given the present subservient mood in London vis-a-vis Washington. Besides, some data are available showing that American combat chemicals are already stationed in Britain, though unitary ones.

[Announcer] Do you see the present British line on the binary issue as a de facto break with the professed official aversion to chemical weapons. After all, London still boasts it was among the first to raise the question of a chemical weapons ban back in the sixties?

[Sorokin] It is a break, and a multiple one. The binary business is part of the whole story. It's also known that London has a contingency plan to produce its own chemical charges, possibly based on the American technology. In any case the Porton Down biochemical military research complex has switched into top gear and there is speculation that some American binarys may eveutually end up with the British Army on the Rhine.

[Announcer] So we can really speak of a British chemical rearmament program following hard on the heels of a similar rearmament across the Atlantic. Does this bring the two partners closer?

[Sorokin] I'd rather say Britain is emulating American plans. It may be added that Britain supports American control of the proposed integrated chemical weapons initiation system through NATO. But in a way yes, the two partners are getting closer together, since both are moving closer to the brink of war.

Protests Expected

LD191439 Moscow TASS in English 1401 GMT 19 May 86

[Text] London, 19 May (TASS)--By TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov:

The Government of Great Britain has officially confirmed the existence of Washington's and London's plans to deploy new-generation American chemical weapons on British territory.

John Stanley, minister of state for the armed forces, speaking on television, said that the deployment of such weapons on the British Isles during "periods of tension" in East-West relations should become one of the options.

The SUNDAY TIMES reported that following the approval of the U.S. plans to "modernize" American chemical arsenals by the NATO Military Planning Committee last week, Washington would surely approach Margaret Thatcher's Cabinet with a demand for the binary weapons deployment in Britain.

So far, the West German Government alone gave its consent. Washington was now expecting the same decision from London. The Pentagon already calculated that only 40 military transport planes would be required to airlift 20,000 units of new chemical weapons to Western Europe.

According to the SUNDAY TIMES, the deployment of American chemical weapons in Britain would generate an unfavorable response from the British public and spark off wide protests.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

SOVIET PRESS CONFERENCE ON NATO BINARY ARMS PLANS

PM221700 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (First Edition) in Russian 22 May 86 p 3

[TASS repott: "Press Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] A press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on the problems of banning chemical weapons was held in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center 20 May. Taking part in it were V.B. Lomeyko, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Pre s Section; Major General A.D. Kuntsevich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; G.S. Stashevskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry International Organizations Section; and Colonel A.P. Kutepov, USSR Ministry of Defense expert.

It was said in the statements that it is now largely a matter of solving the question of whether events will develop in the direction of the complete liquidation of chemical weapons--that barbaric means of mass destruction--or whether the world will be driven into an extremely dangerous round of the arms race as a result of U.S. "expansion of the production of a new type of such weapons--binary weapons.

The course now being followed by the United States and a number of its NATO allies in seeking the bloc's approval for the program of chemical rearmament is fraught with extremely dire consequences for European and universal security.

The implementation of U.S. plans for the production of binary weapons is directly linked by Washington with their subsequent deployment in West Europe, and this threatens to transform densely populated regions of this continent into potential theaters of destructive chemical warfare. The main casualties here would occur primarily among the civilian population.

The Soviet Union counters the course of chemical insanity with a program for chemical disarmament. It has repeatedly submitted specific and realistic proposals within the UN framework, at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in the course of bilateral contacts with the United States--proposals which would ensure the swiftest reaching of agreement on a total, universal, and verifiable ban on chemical weapons. Our main objective is the complete liquidation of chemical weapons and the actual industrial base for their

manufacture, and this was said most definitely in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement. In parallel with this, the USSR also advocates the implementation of a number of interim steps along the path to radical agreement--the adoption of measures to prevent the proliferation of chemical weapons and to rid individual parts of the world of them.

Answers were given to journalists' questions. It was noted in particular that the plans to build up the U.S. chemical potential run contra y to Soviet-U.S. agreements reached at summit level concerning the need for a complete and verifiable ban on chemical weapons.

The USSR approaches the agreements reached in Geneva with the utmost responsibility. It proposed on 15 January a program for mankind's complete liberation from chemical weapons by the end of the century. The provisions of this program materialized in detailed and thoroughly prepared proposals submitted by the Soviet Union at the Geneva Disarmament Conference last April. And yet the U.S. side has not taken a single step in the direction of agreement at the talks. The galvanization of U.S. efforts proceeds in a different direction--to begin as soon as possible the implementation of a large-scale program of chemical rearmament.

It was said in reply to a question concerning the U.S.-FRG agreement on binary weapons that the main meaning of this agreement is that the FRG undertakes to support the start of binary weapons production in the United States, thus setting an example of "Atlantic discipline" to other NATO members and particularly to those who disagree with the new round of the chemical arms race. And as soon as binary weapons appear in U.S. arsenals, the inevitable next step would be their deployment in the regions for which they are destined, in other words West Europe and FRG territory in particular. The stance taken by the FRG as regards binary weapons is, unfortunately, not an isolated instance of the FRG's backing an arms buildup, and this is totally incompatible with its leaders' statements in favor of arms reductions and "the creation of a world with fewer arms." As regards the USSR's stance on verification [kontrol] within the framework of a future convention banning chemical weapons, it was pointed out that the Soviet Union does not imagine any chemical disarmament without the strictest and most reliable verification, including international verification.

It was also noted that the Soviet Union supports and highly values the initiatives of the governments of the GDR and the CSSR and of Bulgaria and Romania on the creation of zones free of chemical weapons in Central Europe and the Balkans, perceiving them as a contribution to efforts aimed at freeing the peoples of the European continent as soon as possible from the chemical threat, at completely eliminating chemical means for waging war.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: VOA USES YELLOW RAIN STORY TO AID U.S. GAS PROGRAM

LD112333 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS -- By TASS News Analyst Valeriy Vavilov:

"The Voice of America" gave a rerun to an old story about the Soviet "yellow rain". For quite some time now Washington has been trying to sell the world its inventions about he "use of Soviet-made toxic weapons" in South-East Asia.

Playing up this false story yet another time, Washington signally forgets to mention numerous conclusions made by authoritative scientists and research institutions that carried out studies denying Washington's inventions.

Let us recall, for example, the conclusions of researchers from the Portondown chemical center of the Ministry of Defense of Great Britain who, according to NEW SCIENTIST magazine, detected no trace of "yellow rain" in samples collected in South-East Asia. Harvard University Professor Matthew Meselson and professor of biology from Yale Thomas Sealy also denied that false story.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the same conclusion were made by Canadian experts who stated, upon completing a large-scale study, that hundreds of samples collected in 35 regions where chemical weapons of that type had allegedly been used, as Washington maintained, demonstrated a complete absence of combat toxic agents.

Speaking of the use of Soviet-manufactured chemical weapons somewhere in Asia, Washington is trying to lay its own fault at somebody else's door. It is well known that during the war in Vietnam Americans sprayed about 100,000 tons of toxic chemicals, including "Agent Orange", over fields and settlements of that country. This operation killed thousands of people, crippled scores of thousands others, affected 43 percent of ploughland and 44 per cent of forests in southern provinces of Vietnam.

Washington needed the story about "Soviet chemical weapons" in order to justify plans for "chemical re-armament" for the U.S. Army, that is, providing it with binary chemical weapons. The U.S. military-industrial complex needs something to justify the Pentagon-developed three-stage program for creating a full-scale chemical arsenal -- the operation that will cost a staggering 10 billion dollars, according to estimates of economic experts. It is absolutely clear that Washington's program for chemical re-armament of NATO constitutes a deadly threat to Europe that is literally stuffed with lethal weapons of every imaginable type.

Chemical weapons which are an atrocious means of mass annihilation must be unconditionally banned and completely destroyed. This is the Soviet Union's stand on the matter. However, Washington is working in the opposite direction. And while it is doing so, it tries to cover up its dangerous course with all kinds of false stories -- something that "the Voice of America" confirmed yet another time.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1423

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

BRIEFS

CW-FREE REGION--Berlin, 7 Jun--The document "Principles and Main Directions of Future Talks Between the GDR, the CSSR, and the FRG on the Creation of a Chemical Weapon-Free Zone in Europe" has been presented to the heads of the Belgian, Danish, Netherlands, and Norwegian diplomatic missions in the GDR. The GDR's readiness for immediate direct contacts with representatives of the said countries, and also of Luxembourg, was confirmed. It was pointed out that talks on creating a chemical weapons-free zone in Europe could make a weighty contribution to the cuase of the universal prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons. The GDR resolutely advocates a universal ban on chemical weapons and, at the same time, the regional settlement of this question as a step in this direction. [TASS report: "Presentation of Document"] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 8 Jun 86 p 4 PM] /9738

CSO: 5200/1423

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

SOVIET PAPER URGES ACTION ON EUROPEAN ARMS LEVELS

PM061404 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (First Edition) in Russian 5 Jun 86 p 1

[Vladimir Katin "International Review": "The Threat to Europe"]

[Text] It is paradoxical but a fact that at the moment, in peacetime, there are as many armaments and as much ammunition on our continent as there ever were during World War II. Nuclear and chemical weapons, missiles, and conventional armaments, to which the United States now intends to add weapons containing a binary nerve paralysis agent -- all this is packed into the relatively small and densely populated area of the West European states. So it is natural that Soviet people should be anxious and wonder why the NATO countries need so many weapons.

They contend that the weapons are needed for the defense of Western Europe in the event of an attack by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact states. There are serious and valid arguments against this. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev recently addressed all people in Western Europe, urging them not to believe the stories about the Soviet Union's aggressiveness. In no circumstances will our country ever commence hostilities against Western Europe unless we and our allies are the targets of an attack by NATO!

The Soviet Union is always providing practical confirmation of its love of peace. It is making a big concession in proposing that Soviet and U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles be removed from the entire continent on condition that Britain and France do not build up their nuclear potential. Our position is also clear on chemical weapons, which must not be present in the European region.

The reaction to these concrete proposals demonstrates the NATO leadership's true intentions on the question of European security. Either they do not respond to our initiatives at all, or they come up with farfetched excuses to avoid even discussing them. The Russians are not to be trusted, do you hear? But we are proposing mutual arms destruction and reduction, by both sides -- by us too! Why should the Soviet Union believe that these mountains of armaments and missile palisades in the NATO countries are kept merely for defense and not for an attack on us? In the first place, you do not need that many weapons for defense. In the second place, the reluctance to reduce weapons on a mutual basis reveals the true aims. Third, no one has ever placed Pershing-2 missiles or chemical weapons in the "defensive armaments" category. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles are, so to speak, classic first-strike weapons. As for binary weapons, no one would ever dream of using them for defense.

So the Soviet Union sees the danger as coming primarily from the Western quarter, from where attacks came on more than one occasion in the prenuclear era. We cannot take seriously statements by U.S. leaders that a partial withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from the NATO countries is taking place. It is not a cut in the overall nuclear potential in Europe, but a reduction of sorts in the number of warheads.

The whole trick is to replace the old nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles (of the sixties) with facilities that are more accurate, have a longer range, and, most important, are more powerful in terms of TNT equivalent.

It is a striking fact that the NATO countries' governments are making regular pedantic statements, as if following a special schedule, about wanting peace and cooperation with the socialist countries and about being ready to help halt the arms race. But the opposite is in fact the case -- dangerous and by no means peaceful preparations are being made. Take the FRG. It is the only NATO country where USSR-targeted U.S. Pershing-2 first-strike missiles are deployed, yet the largest number of cruise missiles is to be installed on West German soil. You would expect Bonn to be the first to respond to the Soviet proposal on removing all U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles from Europe in order to be able to actually implement its slogan about security with fewer weapons. But, alas, this has not happened.

The Soviet Union is advocating a peaceful Europe not in words, but in deeds. We are proposing a series of concrete measures. In response to this the West European capitals say that NATO cannot do without U.S. nuclear weapons since the Warsaw Pact countries would still be strong in conventional armaments. Striving purposefully to relax tension in the continent, the USSR has made a new proposal. The Soviet Union is prepared to reach an accord on a considerable reduction in all components of the European states' ground forces and tactical aircraft, and also of the corresponding U.S. and Canadian forces deployed in Europe. The geographical zone for the reduction would obviously cover the entire territory of Europe -- from the Atlantic to the Urals. Operational-tactical nuclear armaments would be reduced as well as conventional armaments. It is also proposed that an accord be reached on prohibiting chemical weapons and on creating a zone free from them in Europe.

The USSR is proposing that an accord be reached on a considerable reduction in conventional armed forces and armaments, allowing for possible compromises, for bringing the approaches closer together, for discussion and elaboration of common views on details and on particulars. In short, it is necessary to waste no time in sitting down and having a meaningful conversation.

Nothing of the sort! When there is nothing to say they resort to silence. The NATO REPORT bulletin tersely announced the bloc's official reaction 2 weeks after the announcement of the Soviet proposal on the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces: The allies are carefully studying the Soviet proposal. The recent EEC Council of Ministers session in Luxembourg was about to include the discussion of the new Soviet initiatives in the agenda when, at the very last moment, it deferred the matter indefinitely. London and Paris are silent, there is evidence of a certain embarrassment in Bonn. Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher gives assurances that the FRG Government is treating Moscow's idea about reducing armed forces and armaments seriously, although Defense Minister M. Woerner is suggesting that the idea be completely disregarded.

The debate in the Bundestag reflects Western Europe's position as a whole. On one hand, the Soviet proposal on a considerable reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe demolishes once and for all the arguments of those who oppose the idea. In fact, a consistent system of Soviet initiatives is taking shape: Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles will not only be removed from Europe, but conventional armaments will also be considerably reduced. This is the high road to reliable security on the continent and it cannot be ignored.

On the other hand, U.S. pressure is telling on the allies, who have been urged by the U.S. defense secretary personally to "resist." It is indicative that there was no reaction to the Soviet proposal at the NATO Council spring session in the Canadian city of Halifax.

The problem of reducing conventional armaments is a subject for responsible negotiations. The size of the question will make it possible to undo the knot that has been drawing tighter and tighter for many years in Vienna, at the talks on the reduction of forces in central Europe. At the same time, it would be senseless to argue that without nuclear weapons Western Europe would be "easy prey for an armada of Soviet tanks." Indeed, the general political climate on the continent would markedly improve if there were broad highways of businesslike cooperation there instead of barracks, bases, and missile silos. We invite the West Europeans to get down to tackling this problem on a joint basis. Logic is such that friendly relations cannot be built on a foundation of missiles, on tanks of nerve gas, on the barrels of space laser gunds. All this hampers the development of cooperation and poses a real threat to Europe.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1418

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

USSR: COMMENTS, REPORTS ON JUNE OPENING OF CD SUMMER SESSION

Commentary on Need for Disarmament

PM111440 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Jun 86 p 3

[Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov "View of Events": "Time of Important Decisions"]

[Text] The next session of the Conference on Disarmament will open in Geneva in a few days, on 10 June. The upcoming forum is attracting considerable public and press attention. This is natural. More than 50,000 nuclear charges have been accumulated in the world as a result of the arms race unleashed by imperialism, and their total yield is 5,000 times greater than that of all the explosives used in the entire history of wars. The astronomical sum of $800 billion is spent on producing tools of destruction and death in the world every year. Under these conditions the dismantling of the material apparatus of war has become the truly key problem of international relations.

This session of the Conference on Disarmament is starting its work at a time when the USSR's peace offensive is continuing. M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement, the foreign policy initiatives formulated in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress, and the Soviet Union's proposals advanced since the congress have elicited and are continuing to elicit a very broad international response and are inspiring new hopes in the hearts of millions. Eminent politicians and public figures of various countries, well-known scientists, and authoritative military experts highly evaluate the comprehensive Soviet program for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and respond warmly to the USSR's appeal for the sword of Damocles, which has been hanging over the people since the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, to be removed finally and irreversibly before the end of the century.

True to its principled policy of peace, the Soviet Union is going to the Geneva forum firmly resolved to do everything possible to advance the cause of disarmament. Our country proceeds from the premise that now that the world is at a critical juncture, we must not confine ourselves to compromise decisions that would slow the arms race in certain directions merely in order for it to accelerate with redoubled force in other directions. The time has come when all states, regardless of their social system and level of economic development, must together take large steps toward ridding the planet of nuclear and other weapons, so that security for each person also means security for all people.

Of course, the road to a nuclear-free world is not easy or simple. Mankind has to overcome the numerous obstacles and barriers being erected by the enemies of detente and peace. Chief among the obstacles of this kind are the attempts by U.S. and NATO imperialist circles to militarize space and saturate near-earth space with space-strike weapons, turning it into a military briedgehead. You do not have to be a specialist in the military sphere to realize that the situation could get out of control as a result of the transfer of the arms race to space. This is why the Soviet Union, pointing out that there is no type of weapon that it is not prepared to reduce and eliminate on a reciprocal basis, by agreement with other states, particularly emphasizes the paramount, exclusive importance of the question of strike weapons in space.

The world's people have a vital interest in ending nuclear explosions. The USSR's position on this is well known: Not only does our country consistently pursue a policy of reaching an international accord on a total ban on nuclear weapon tests but it has also unilaterally introduced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, calling on the United States to follow its example.

This is one approach to the key problems of the present day, many of which will be discussed at the Geneva conference -- an approach dictated by concern for peace and by profound understanding of the fact that disarmament is the chief way to assert new, just international usages and to build a safe world. This approach is hailed by all who value clear skies over the planet. It arouses a different, diametrically opposite reaction in the camp of the U.S. and NATO imperialist circles, which have still not abandoned their illusory but extremely dangerous hopes that they will be able to dictate their will to sovereign countries and peoples by relying on force and turning the latest achievements of scientific and technical thinking into weapons of mass destruction. "Nuclear war cannot be won and must not be started," the U.S. President declared back in 1984 in the pages of the New York weekly AMERICAN LEGION MAGAZINE. These are the words, but what is Washington's actual policy and with what does it actually respond to the Soviet peace initiatives?

It responds to the appeal to prevent the arms race from being shifted into space and to turn near-earth space into an arena of peaceful and mutually advantageous scientific cooperation by accelerating preparations for "star wars." To the proposal to ban nuclear weapon tests -- by conducting more and more nuclear explosions on Nevada test sites. To the initiatives aimed at strengthening strategic stability -- by placing explosives beneath SALT II, which was the result of many years of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the seventies. To the calls to ban barbarous chemical weapons -- by sanctioning the production of a new generation of such weapons -- binary weapons. Different actions, but the aim is the same: to upset at any cost and by any means the military-strategic parity that has come about in the world, so as to dictate its will on sovereign countries and peoples by acquiring a longer and sharper nuclear space sword.

Of course, the Soviet Union cannot and will not look on without concern as the United States feverishly replenishes its already chock-full military arsenals with more and more new kinds and systems of destructive weapons and tears up existing agreements and accords. Our country has always found -- and undoubtedly will continue to find -- an effective reply to any challenge from those who would like once again to test our military and technological potential.

But the policy of competing with one another to produce tools of destruction and death, pushing the planet toward the abyss of nuclear self-immolation, is not our choice; this policy runs counter to common sense and is arousing growing opposition in all peace-loving states and all peoples. Statistics attest that, whereas more than 5 million perished in 18th-century wars and almost 6 million in 19th-century wars, in our century World War I took 10 million and World War II more than 50 million human lives.

But even these terrible figures relate to the "prenuclear era" -- so what would a nuclear clash mean today, when so much ammunition has been stockpiled in the world that specialists merely argue over how many times or tens of times over mankind could be destroyed?!

Changes in the modern world, the fruits of the scientific and technical revolution, and the very course of events attest very convincingly that the world has become too small and fragile for wars and all kinds of "strong-arm methods" and that the time has come to resolutely revise the aggressive and hegemonist thesis constructed in the West that force and force alone is the only "effective argument" in relations among countries and peoples; it is quite obvious that not only nuclear war but also the preparations for it can bring no one political gain. In other words, it is a question of the need for new approaches and new political thinking, which presupposes a higher degree of flexibility in foreign policy and the readiness and will to reach agreement with partners in an honest and businesslike manner on reducing and then eliminating the threat of nuclear war. To reach agreement before it is too late.

The facts attest that sober assessments of what is happening has great difficulty making its way through the dense layer of prejudices and preconceptions in the thinking of many Western politicians, and some of them seemingly have no desire whatsoever to draw serious conclusions from their own and other people's experience. And yet, in the face of the threat of a nuclear apocalypse, mankind as a whole is beginning to comprehend the simple truth that, in order to survive, it is necessary to proceed in international relations not from narrowly understood interests, which set countries and peoples against each other, but from interests and desires common to all. Graphic confirmation of this is provided by the constantly strengthening front of active fighters for peace. Is the growing potential of peace not indicated, for example, by such facts as the recent powerful demonstrations in defense of peace in Greece, the "people's peace march" which began a few days ago in Japan, or, say, the "great peace march" on Washington" taking place in the United States?

The memorial stone in Hiroshima bears this inscription: "Sleep peacefully, the mistake will not be repeated." This oath to the memory of those who died, an oath to the present and future generations, obliges politicians of all states to rise above national egoism, tactical calculations, arguments, and dissension, which are insignificant by comparison with the preservation of our chief asset -- peace on the planet. Time will show whether those circles in the West that are so stubbornly opposed to progress in the cause of disarmament will realize that in our time sensible solutions cannot be found on the warpath -- neither international nor internal solutions. As for the Soviet country, the struggle against the arms race and for the preservation and strengthening of peace was and still is the main direction of its foreign policy.

Soviet, Mexican Delegates Interviewed

PM091351 Moscow IZVESTIYA (Morning Edition) in Russian 7 Jun 86 p 5

[Interview with Garcia Robles, head of Mexican delegation at the Geneva disarmament talks, and V.L. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation, by L. Kamynin under the rubric "IZVESTIYA Round Table" and the headline: "Disarmament -- The Key to Peace" first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] On 10 June, the summer session of the Conference on Disarmament opens in Geneva. The work of the conference is the subject of today's conversation, the participants in which are Ambassador Alfonso Garcia Robles, Nobel Peace Prize winner, well-known figure in the disarmament sphere, and head of the Mexican delegation at the Geneva conference; and Ambassador V.L. Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation.

[Kamynin] Would each of you give us a few words, please, on the importance of the conference.

A. Garcia Robles: It is hard to overestimate the importance of the Conference on Disarmament from the standpoint of the tasks it is intended to fulfill. This forum is irreplaceable for conducting multilateral disarmament talks, considering that it is a question of the vital interests of the whole world and, one can say, of mankind's survival. I would like to remind you that the conference is the only multilateral forum intended for holding talks on disarmament problems with the participation of 40 countries -- the five nuclear powers and a large group of states representing all the main political groups and geographical regions of the world.

V.L. Israelyn: I agree with this appraisal. At the same time we also cannot fail to say that the potential of the conference, which has been working since 1962, is clearly underutilized. The aim of this international forum is to hold talks with the ultimate goal of achieving real results in the sphere of curbing the arms race. However, this is not happening; through the fault of the present U.S. Administration and some of its allies the conference has been deadlocked in recent years on the basic points of its agenda, primarily on the entire range of nuclear disarmament issues. Some people in the West, primarily in Washington, are quite unable to overcome the inertia of the past, when security was primarily seen through the prism of positions of strength and military-technical decisions. Hence the "negotiation deadlocks" at the Geneva conference. A different stand is taken by the Soviet Union: It attaches very great significance to the role of the Conference on Disarmament and is doing everything possible to make it an effective mechanism for resolving urgent disarmament issues.

[Kamynin] Which questions of arms limitation and disarmament do you consider to be the most topical today?

A. Garcia Robles: The most important questions, as defined in the conference agenda, are the following: ceasing nuclear weapon tests, achieving nuclear disarmament, averting a nuclear war, and preventing an arms race in space. If I were to single out certain issues in degree of importance, I would primarily note those that figured in the Dehli Declaration by the leaders of six states, namely: halting nuclear tests and preventing an arms race in space. Of great significance is a ban on all other types of mass destruction weapons, chemical weapons in particular. Talks on this question have been under way at the conference for many years now.

V.L. Israelyan: The USSR's view on priority disarmament issues is set out in the 15 January statement by CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and in the 27th CPSU Congress materials. These put forward specific proposals relating to the complete elimination of all types of mass destruction weapons over the next 15 years, and also other far-reaching measures to strengthen international security. The Soviet peace program has aroused keen interest among the conference participants and has been widely commented on by them. It should be noted that, developing our approach, the Soviet Union has submitted specific proposals at the Conference on Disarmament on the points of the agenda designated by my colleague. We proceed from the fact that it is now essential to ensure that we move on to organized, purposeful, and deeper work on the most topical issues of the conference agenda, and the Soviet delegation is ready for such work.

A. Garcia Robles: For my part I must add that, in my opinion, M.S. Gorbachev's statement has had a favorable effect on the work of the conference. This is not just my opinion -- I have heard many positive appraisals from other conference members. I personally have the impression that the Soviet leadership sincerely believes in the possibility of implementing the idea of stage-by-stage disarmament and the ultimate elimination of mass destruction weapons.

There are no reasons why this program cannot form the basis of international actions. If we cannot progress in a number of directions at once, we must first select an area in which progress is most realistic. We could start, for example, at the first stage. I believe this to be the correct approach.

[Kamynin] What role can the Conference on Disarmament play in talks on banning nuclear tests? Have talks not yet been held at the conference on this particularly topical question?

V.L. Israelyan: The Soviet Union's proposal in favor of beginning multilateral talks within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament on all aspects of the problem of banning nuclear weapons tests, including the appropriate verification measures [adekvatnyye mery kontrolya], can serve as the answer to the first part of your question. Incidentally, our country is setting a practical example of the solution of this question by extending its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests to 6 August. The aim of the talks must be to draw up a draft treaty that would effectively ban the conducting of any test explosions anywhere and by anyone and would include provisions acceptable to everyone to prevent the circumvention of this ban by conducting nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. I must add that the Soviet Union is prepared for any form of talks -- bilateral Soviet-American talks or trilateral talks with the participation of Britain also. We are ready for any version of an accord in this respect -- just as long as an agreement really is reached.

With regard to the second part of your question, I will say that there are no inoperable technical obstacles preventing an accord. The chief obstacle lies in the unconstructive stand taken by the United States, which needs to continue testing nuclear explosions in order to implement its programs to create [sozdaniye] new types of nuclear and space weapons. It is for this reason that Washington is now aiming to torpedo SALT II.

A. Garcia Robles: I have pondered this question more than once and I will frankly say that it really is hard to understand why a problem of such importance as banning nuclear tests cannot be the subject of talks at the conference. Year after year, the group of nonaligned and neutral countries, and also the socialist countries, state their desire to hold talks on this question. It seems to me that there are also some among the Western powers who would be willing to become partners in such talks.

Generally, the question of banning tests is the key issue in stopping the nuclear arms race. Consequently, when the leaders of the six countries that signed the messaged appealed to the USSR and the United States to establish a moratorium, they intended that their example be followed by the other nuclear powers. We still believe that a moratorium could be a very important practical step on the way to stopping nuclear tests, but only the first step. It should not be put off indefinitely; after all, a moratorium is not an end in itself, it is intended to facilitate the adoption of other, more far-reaching measures.

[Kamynin] How correct are assertions that difficulties in questions of verifying [kontrol za] a ban on nuclear tests are the main reason for some countries refusing to hold talks on this issue?

A. Garcia Robles: Indeed, there is often talk of the "unresolved nature" of the verification [kontrol] problems. However, one cannot fail to see that in recent years the situation regarding the problem of verifying [kontrol za] observance of the most diverse agreements has undergone very serious changes. Ensuring reliable verification [kontrol] is now fully possible.

V.L. Israelyan: The Soviet Union is open to verification [kontrol]. As long as it is verification [kontrol za] of the observance of specific accords.

[Kamynin] The Soviet Union recently submitted at the Geneva conference new proposals on banning chemical weapons. To what extent, in your opinion, will they promote progress at the talks in resolving this issue?

A. Garcia Robles: I regard these proposals as very constructive. They must dispel many differences at the talks on banning chemical weapons.

Since these Soviet proposals were made there can now be no doubt in anyone's mind that the Soviet Union has enough goodwill or desire to permit on-site inspection [proverki na mestakh] on its territory. The importance of the proposals lies in the fact that they are devoted to one of the most important and, if I may express myself thus, delicate aspects of talks on this problem.

V.L. Israelyan: In an attempt to make decisive progress in the agreement of a convention banning chemical weapons -- which has dragged on for an inordinately long time -- on 22 April, the Soviet Union submitted a number of new proposals making it possible to eliminate many persisting differences. At the same time it must be said that the realization of U.S. plans for the production of binary chemical weapons and their deployment in Western Europe would have the most negative effect on the Conference on Disarmament and raise a serious obstacle to the drafting of an international convention on this issue.

The storm clouds of the threat of war that looms over mankind forces us to think about the main issue: The time has come to act. The importance of the Conference on Disarmament is greater than ever before. There is a good foundation for this conference to fulfill its duty and for progress to be achieved at the talks at the forthcoming session. This foundation is the constructive proposals put forward by the Soviet Union, other socialist countries, nonaligned states, and all other states interested in freeing mankind of its heavy and dangerous burden -- the arms race.

Session Opens

LD101507 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

Forty delegations of the countries participating in the disarmament conference have got together in the council hall of the Palace of Nations today after a month's break.

Addressing the first plenary meeting, chairman of the conference for June Konstantin Tellalov (Bulgaria) read out a message to the participants from Todor Zhivkov, chairman of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. The message says among other things that the peoples of the whole world are following the Geneva forum with hope, expecting it to make an essential contribution to lessening the threat of war and preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

It is necessary to realise what dangerous line the world has approached in this day and age, Viktor Israelyan, head of the USSR delegation, said. The recent statement of the United States on its actual abandonment of the SALT-2 treaty is aimed at further building up tensions. The unprecedented arms race pursued by Washington and its NATO allies, and the intention of the USA to spread it into outer space require from mankind a mobilisation of all forces to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

Among the most important tasks confronting the conference is the need to make progress on the issue of a ban on nuclear testing as a step leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons, the Soviet representative said. Among the other top-priority aims are prevention of the creation, testing, and deployment of space weapons and a ban on chemical weapons.

Both great powers -- the USSR and the USA -- should demonstrate their preparedness for a fruitful dialogue and give up the old prejudices and wrong concepts, said Swedish representative Mai-Britt Theorin. Sweden totally disagrees with those who are trying to belittle the significance and urgency of an agreement on ending nuclear testing. She expressed gratification with the USSR's decision to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions and pointed out that the current situation is particularly favourable for making such a moratorium bilateral. Touching upon a ban on chemical weapons, she urged all countries to give up the production of nuclear weapons for the period of the talks and expressed regret over the recent decision of the United States in favour of binary chemical weapons. Abandonment of SALT-2 and ABM Treaties may only spur on the arms race, the Swedish representative said.

The statement by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG vice chancellor and minister for foreign affairs, left a contradictory impression. While welcoming the "Geneva spirit" and the Soviet proposals on the limitation of weapons, he was at the same time trying to present the latest decisions of the NATO leading bodies as "peaceable actions" directed at ensuring progress at the disarmament talks.

Israelyan Addresses Group

LD110620 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Jun 86

[Text] The summer session of the Conference on Disarmament has opened in Geneva. Our correspondent Vladimir Dmitriyev reports: On the agenda of the multilateral talks is the wide range of the most topical issues of the present time: averting the arms race in space, achieving nuclear disarmament, halting nuclear weapons tests, banning chemical weapons, and others.

Representatives of the FRG, the USSR, Sweden, and several other countries addressed the first plenary meeting of the session. Genscher, minister of foreign affairs and FRG vice chancellor, spoke in favor of the earliest possible ban on nuclear weapons tests. This statement has been met with satisfaction by the participants of the conference. At the same time he attempted to present the latest NATO proposals as peace-loving and constructive. In reality these proposals do not contain any mutually acceptable solutions. The widely representative nature of the conference -- the states from all continents, various social and economic systems, members of military alliances and both the nonaligned and neutral, nuclear and nonnuclear which are participating in it -- are in essence undertaking an important role, which the conference has to play in ensuring nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet Union, said Comrade Israelyan, the USSR representative at the conference, supports the earliest possible start of multilateral talks on halting the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament at the conference. It is also necessary to achieve tangible progress in banning nuclear weapons tests, the Soviet representative stressed. Our country's position on the issue of elimination of chemical weapons in this century will remain firm and unalterable.

The International Year of Peace, the Soviet representative stated in conclusion, obliges us to undertake the most vigorous efforts for ensuring a radical turn to the better in world affairs. And for this, the constructive approach of all participants in the Conference on Disarmament, and their political will for the earliest possible achievement of mutually acceptable accords, is necessary.

Interest in Soviet Initiatives

PM121339 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 10 Jun 86 p 4

[V. Levonov commentary "Time for Action"]

[Text] The latest session of the Conference on Disarmament opens in Geneva on 10 June. It is opening in troubled times. The new round initiated by Washington and its NATO allies in the unprecedented arms race and the U.S. steps aimed at extending the arms race to space demand a mobilization of efforts to avert a nuclear catastrophe. Bilateral and multilateral talks on arms limitation and disarmament must be shifted into a higher gear. This fully applies to the Conference on Disarmament -- the body for multilateral talks in which all nuclear powers and states of leading importance in the military sphere are taking part.

The way to peace without weapons has been indicated in the Soviet proposals for the total elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction means by the beginning of the 21st century, set forth in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement and confirmed by the 27th CPSU Congress. They were at the focus of discussion during the conference's last session. The program for phased nuclear disarmament attracted special attention and met with the approval of a substantial majority of the states represented at this forum. Participants now face the task of discussing specific measures to promote the implementation of the program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the current century.

The proposals on questions of nuclear disarmament introduced at the conference by some other states -- India, Argentina, and China -- are an additional indication of the topicality of the Soviet initiative.

One of the most important tasks of the session is to achieve tangible progress in the question of banning nuclear weapon tests. The Soviet Union favors the immediate opening of talks on a total ban on these tests. It is prepared to accept any form of talks, including talks within the framework of the conference, and any option for an accord, just to ensure that a corresponding agreement is achieved.

The USSR and the socialist community proceed from the premise that a ban on nuclear tests is one of the most important and pressing tasks. The stance of the socialist countries has the backing of the nonaligned and neutral states. Many Western countries also favor a ban on nuclear explosions. The accident at the Chernobyl AES has added a new tenor to the whole range of questions pertaining to nuclear disarmament, including the ban on nuclear explosions. Incidentally, this problem has probably been studied and elaborated in greater detail than any other disarmament issue. All that is needed is the political will to take this step that is not complicated in technical terms.

This will, however, is lacking in some people.

The United States is continuing its nuclear weapon tests despite the demands of the overwhelming majority of states and the international public. This cannot but call in question the sincerity of Washington's utterances about its devotion to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

As for the Soviet Union, it has demonstrated in practice its willingness to take practical steps toward ending nuclear weapon tests without delay. Our country has extended the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, introduced 6 August 1985, on more than one occasion, issuing urgent appeals to the United States to make the moratorium a reciprocal one. Recently the general secretary of the CPSU Cenetral Committee reaffirmed his proposal to meet with U.S. President Reagan without delay in order to reach an agreement on banning nuclear tests. The decision to extend its moratorium on nuclear tests through 6 August was not an easy one to make for the Soviet Union, for after all, the American side has already carried out 12 tests during this time. This decision shows the depth of our conviction that it is essential to achieve a ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible.

The nonaligned and neutral countries, welcoming the Soviet moratorium, called on the United States to follow the USSR's example. Just like the socialist states, they favor immediate talks at the Conference on Disarmament with a view to ending nuclear explosions. It is proposed to establish a special subsidiary body at the conference for this purpose that would be entrusted with the task of drafting a treaty on a complete and universal ban on nuclear weapon tests. A Soviet draft treaty was submitted at the conference in 1982, and there are also other states' proposals on this subject. The time for action has come.

The 27th CPSU Congress has reaffirmed the immutability of the USSR's principled stance on the question of the nonmilitarization of space. The Soviet Union resolutely favors renouncing the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space arms. It most categorically opposes the extension of the arms race to space because it is aware of the dangerous consequences this would entail.

The USSR has introduced at the Conference on Disarmament a proposal for the elaboration and conclusion of an international agreement guaranteeing the immunity of artifical earth satellites, banning the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of antisatellite systems, and making provision for the elimination of existing

system of this kind. The special committee for the prevention of an arms race in space that has been established within the framework of the conference is about to begin discussing this proposal.

The USSR's major new initiatives also provide a good basis for the quick conclusion of the elaboration of the convention banning chemical weapons. The Soviet proposal takes into account the position of many other states, including the United States, and -- as was noted at the conference, makes it possible to overcome situations that formerly presented an impasse. The fact that the United States and NATO have given the go-ahead to the production of binary chemical weapons and their subsequent siting in Western Europe is causing serious concern in the world community.

The question of banning radiological weapons is also becoming very acute. There is no justification for the fact that the provisions of a corresponding treaty, the draft of which was submitted to the Conference on Disarmament back in 1979, have still not been agreed. There is also the topical question of ensuring the safe development of nuclear power engineering that is also on the conference agenda. The proposals put forward in this respect by M.S. Gorbachev in his 14 May television speech are intended to give addtional impetus to the conference proceedings.

The International Year of Peace makes it incumbent on states to take the most vigorous action to achieve a radical breakthrough in international affairs. The current session of the Conference on Disarmament can and must play an important role in this.

Resumption of Talks Noted

LD092148 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 9 Jun 86

[Text] Geneva June 9 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Korzhev reports:

A session of the Conference on Disarmament of 1986 resumes here tomorrow. While the spring part of the session was regarded a preparatory one, the summer session is to discuss questions in essence and draw up the final report to be submitted to the regular session of the United Nations General Assembly. In the International Year of Peace people of the world turn with particular hope to the Geneva forum, expecting that after many years of the stalemate at the talks, breakthroughs will finally be achieved in the solution of topical questions of ending the arms race and achieving disarmament.

Addressing a press conference in the Palace of Nations today, chairman of the conference for the current month, Konstantin Tellalov of Bulgaria, pointed out that two questions are now of particular importance at the session -- the ending of nuclear tests and banning of chemical weapons.

He said the extention by the Soviet Union of its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions must give a fresh impetus to the work of the Geneva conference, the more so since the majority of its 40 participants persistently demand effective measures in this direction.

Quite the contrary, the latest developments in the questions of banning chemical weapons were unfavourable.

Konstantin Tellalov said that at a time when advance was started on this item on the agenda of the conference, when the Soviet Union tabled new proposals which make it possible to overcome a number of differences, the U.S. Administration adopted the decision to go ahead with the production of binary chemical weapons and their deployment in Western Europe. The implementation of these decisions will face the conference with new problems. If the agreement becomes impossible, Washington will be responsible for this, Tellalov said.

The head of the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria also pointed to the importance of such items on the agenda as prevention of nuclear war and of the militarisation of outer space.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1418

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR EARLY JUNE CRITICISMS ON U.S. TESTS

USSR Not To Permit U.S. Superiority

LD061729 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Vladimir Tsvetov commentary]

[Text] As we reported earlier, the United States has carried out an underground nuclear explosion at the test site in Nevada. This is the 5th U.S. nuclear-weapons test to be officially announced this year, and the 12th since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. We now have a news commentary. At the microphone is Political Observer Vladimir Tsvetov.

It has become axiomatic that the cessation of all nuclear explosions is the first step toward abolishing nuclear weapons. That this is incontrovertible has been understood by everyone on earth. Even Washington has understood it. And, paradoxically, it is precisely because this is beyond dispute that the United States has refused to join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions. The U.S. Administration was unwilling to join us in taking the first step toward the abolition of nuclear weapons because it was preparing to take the last step toward initiating, on an unprecedented scale; a new spiral of the arms race, including the race in nuclear arms.

The underground nuclear blast of 5 June is closely linked, in its military aspect and also politically and logically, to the announcment by the U.S. President on 27 May that the United States is in fact renoucing future observance of the Soviet-American accords on limiting strategic offensive arms. In an attempt to justify its truly antihuman policy in the sphere of nuclear armaments, the United States has resorted to lies. The accusations that the Soviet Union has violated SALT I and SALT II are unfounded, as was convincingly demonstrated at a news conference on 4 June by Comrade Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister; and Comrade Bessmertnykh, USSR deputy foreign minister. To what was said at the news conference, one may add the following: Renunciation of all nuclear tests makes it possible to freeze the qualitative state of the nuclear warheads and bombs for which strategic armaments are the means of delivery. The Soviet Union has done this -- even unilaterally. In other words, the Soviet Union has not only observed its accord with the United States on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, but has also halted the development of the main thing for which those arms are needed: its nuclear arsenal.

The United States has declined to follow our example. It has not renounced underground nuclear explosions, and has renounced observance of the SALT I and SALT II treaties. Will the United States succeed, as a result of these actions, in achieving military superiority over the USSR? The Soviet Government statement to the U.S. Government says clearly that the U.S. side must have no illusions: The Soviet Union will take necessary practical measures to prevent any undermining of military-strategic parity.

U.S. Justifications Rebutted

LD061903 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 6 Jun 86

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

Having promised to go "an extra mile" to the creation of truly mutual restraint in the sphere of strategic arms, President of the United States Ronald Reagan, apparently, decided to accentuate his progress toward this publicly proclaimed aim by U.S. nuclear explosions.

In the past ten months, that is, from August 6, 1985, to June 5 of this year, the United States conducted 12 nuclear weapon tests at the test site in Nevada. President Reagan's bombastic propaganda statement about the United States "restraint" in the sphere of strategic arms proved to be another hoax. Meanwhile, the U.S. nuclear tests were "extra" ones, indeed, for over the same period the Soviet Union which proclaimed a year-long moratorium on nuclear explosions, has been steadily observing its commitments.

It is important to emphasise that any lag of the USA in the sphere of nuclear explosions is out of question. In the post-war period, Washington conducted almost 40 percent more nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union.

Reagan proclaims that the aim of his administration is, allegedly, "significant reduction f the existing nuclear arsenals." And he immediately explains that the best way to solve this task is for the USA to refuse to observe all agreed-upon restrictions on these arsenals. As if mocking common sense, the White House declares that the only reliable way to the reduction of nuclear arms is through their uncontrolled build up by the USA. According to Reagan, the militarisation of outer space can be prevented only by inundating near-earth space with thousands of units of nuclear weapons with nuclear charges. It is now asserted in Washington that nuclear tests can be stopped only by the holding of dozens of new U.S. explosions.

Perhaps, not a single government in the world resorted in the recent past to such brazen and absurd juggling with words to justify the preparation for war, as Washington.

The ending of nuclear testing would be the simplest and most effective barrier to the arms race. Agreement on ending explosions is easily verifiable. As is known, the Soviet Union proposed an all-embracing system of verification of the ned to testing, including on-site inspections. In conditions of the existing parity of nuclear forces of the opposing sides, the ban on testing or, to start with, a moratorium on nuclear explosions, cannot damage the security of any side.

The problem of nuclear explosions is the touchstone, on which the attitude of some or other government to the entire range of problems of war and peace is tested. The administration insisting on its right to continue nuclear testing unilaterally will present itself to the whole world as an adversary of the solution of international problems through compromise and talks, as an apologist of the nuclear arms race.

Observers are grimly joking that if Reagan promised to cover two, and not one, "extra mile" along the road of "restraint" he would, probably, plan not 15 but 30 nuclear explosions for 1986, and would stage them in the atmosphere.

Link to SALT II Policy

PM111525 Moscow IZVESTIYA (Morning Edition) in Russian 8 Jun 86 p 4

[Report by L. Koryavin: "At the Nuclear Abyss. The Echo of a New Lethal Weapon Test in Nevada"]

[Text] Washington -- The latest nuclear explosion in Nevada is the apotheosis of the unbridled militarist campaign recently unleashed in the United States. Throughout the past week the U.S. military machine has been running at full speed. Not only the conveyor belts of the military-industrial complex, but also the carefully developed propaganda system. This has been set in motion in order to stupefy public opinion and justify the arms race.

First the U.S. president and then an entire flock of "hawks" came down on SALT II. Washington has deliberately decided to break the restrictive barrier and release the flywheel of the arms race. The unceasing nuclear tests are also subordinate to this aim. Washington is placing its stake on strength. It refused to join the moratorium introduced by the Soviet Union and, forcing the pace of nuclear weapons modernization, is attempting to use these weapons in its political game in the international arena. In his most recent message to Congress, President Reagan presented the "argument" that increasing U.S. military might will, allegedly, assist negotiations on reaching agreement on nuclear arms reductions.

The latest test is the 5th this year and the 12th since the Soviet Union introduced its unilateral moratorim on 6 August 1985. In all, the number of officially announced U.S. nuclear explosions carried out since 1951 has reached 651!

Symbolically, the code name of the latest explosion is "ravine" [Ushchelye]. It is precisely into the nuclear ravine that the American maniacs threaten to hurl mankind. And another thing. The explosion was blasphemously carried out on 5 June -- on World Environmental Conservation Day, traditionally marked in accordance with a UN resolution.

When preparations were under way for the latest test, a group of activists from the antiwar movement once again tried to penetrate the testing ground in Nevada. Risking their lives, they appealed for other lives to be saved -- lives threatened by nuclear death. The activists said that as a result of the unceasing tests in Nevada the atmosphere in the United States is being deliberately poisoned. With underground explosions, they stressed, radioactivity is ejected that is damaging to people's health and the environment.

The group of daredevil activists who appeared in Nevada are not the only people who are indignant at the U.S. Administration policy. The representatives of many political and social circles are also deeply alarmed by the continuing nuclear tests and the White House desire to torpedo SALT II. Serious concern is also apparent in the U.S. Congress.

Norman Dicks, member of the House of Representatives, has submitted a resolution urging the administration not to raise the ceiling on the deployment of strategic systems defined by the corresponding arms control agreements. The congressman stressed that the draft resolution he has submitted is aimed at "preventing the rejection of exceptionally important numerical limits on arms without Congress' approval." In the Capitol building prominent U.S. senators held a press conference during which they

stated their decisive support of SALT II. "The President's rejection of SALT II," Senator John Chafee said, "will lead to the collapse of the arms control process and renew the arms race. The administration has taken a shortsighted and dangerous decision."

In his speech Senator John Heinz pointed out the fact that the Soviet Union strictly observes the quantitative restrictions on strategic weapons systems defined by SALT II. In the words of Senator Dale Bumpers SALT II enjoys the support in Congress of representatives of both the Democratic and Republican parties. "If we fail to persuade the President to alter his decision," he stressed, "the nuclear arms race will get out of control." Sensible words. They should be heeded by the White House, which, contrary to U.S. national intersts, is continuing nuclear tests and whipping up the arms race.

U.S. Seeks Continued Modernization

LD091642 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 9 Jun 86

["United States Playing With Fire"--TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, June 9 TASS--By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev.

Over ten months ago the Soviet Union announced its moratorium on all nuclear explosions and has been steadily observing this unilateral obligation.

Over the same period, the United States conducted 12 nuclear weapon tests at the range in Nevada. The U.S. Administration intends to set off 15 nuclear devices in 1986 alone. Moreover, the White House is going to spend about 2,000 million [2 billion] dollars on the reconstruction of the nuclear test site in Nevada.

An agreement on a complete ban on nuclear explosions would end the construction of new systems of weapons of mass destruction and would prevent the perfection of the old systems. Both supporters of the curbing of the arms race and apologist of U.S. power pressure" on socialist countries agree with this conclusion.

Unbiased experts use this conclusion as an argument in favour of the United States' joining the Soviet moratorium, while representatives of the White House use it to justify their course at the continued testing.

Washington sees the "main flaw" of the Soviet initiative for ending the explosions precisely in the fact that the moratorium interferes with the modernisation of nuclear weapons. Meanwhile the sense in ending nuclear testing is precisely to make nuclear arsenals dated and ineffective, to prevent the modernisation of weapons and thus to lessen the possibility of the use of weapons of a great destructive force.

Even the most zealous apologists of the concept of a first nuclear strike can hardly be expected to agree lightly to the use of untested systems of weapons whose consequences are unpredictable.

Over many years the U.S. side has been asserting, in order to justify its obstructionist stand, that the existing means of verification of the observance of the agreements on banning exposions are "not reliable enough". But the Soviet Union recently advanced large-scale proposals on the verification of the ban on explosions, including measures of on-site inspection.

According to the most stringent criteria, the question of control can no longer be described as an obstacle to achieving an agreement on nuclear explosions.

Washington "welcomed" the new Soviet initiatives. But, showing distorted logic, it immediately declared that the United States agrees to the verification of continued nuclear testing, not its ban.

A simple enumeration of "arguments" which Washington has advanced of late against the ban on nuclear testing, the steps of the present U.S. Administration to continue tests shows clearly what is the worth of the speeches of U.S. representatives about their striving to "make nuclear weapons obsolete and impotent". The problem of nuclear weapons testing is the touchstone to see what the policy of some or other governments in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction is really like.

Those who strive for the elimination of nuclear weapons declare for a ban on nuclear testing. Those who clutch at such weapons are doing everything so that nuclear tests continue.

In the nuclear age, in conditions when humanity approached the brink of univeral catastrophe, Washington should discard its usual "logic" of arms race, should abandon the Stone Age mode of thinking. Consent to the ending of nuclear testing, to the resumption of the talks on a comprehensive test ban could become a first step of the present U.S. Administration to pass on from confrontation to normal international relations.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1419

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA: NEW ZEALAND MINISTER REBUFFS U.S. PRESSURE

PM101405 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 8 Jun 86 p 5

[Own correspondent O. Skalkin dispatch: "No Intention of Submitting. New Zealand and U.S. Importunities"]

[Text] Sydney, 7 Jun -- Propaganda baiting of New Zealand has been continuing unabated for many months, inspired and financed by the United States. Washington stubbornly refuses to acknowledge the finality of Wellington's decision to close the country's ports to foreign ship with nuclear weapons on board and is reckoning on making New Zealand unconditionally support its strategy.

Curious information about this is contained in a report submitted by the USIA to the House Appropriations Committee of Congress. Substantiating its budget requests for 1987, the Reagan administration's propaganda center dilates on its tasks, including in New Zealand, and also on the methods by which they will be realized.

Regarding New Zealand, the USIA proceeds from the unacceptability to U.S. interests of the idea of the country being proclaimed a nuclear-free zone with the consequences ensuing from that. Despite the fact that this line now reflects the government's fundamental principle in international affairs and is embodied in legislation submitted to parliament for consideration, the USIA intends actively to oppose the New Zealand Government's policy. The NEW ZEALAND PRESS ASSOCIATION dwells on the methods which it is proposed to use. The USIA, the agency report states, pays for journalists, politicians, and other categories of people to travel to the United States. Upon their return they are used to agitate for the country to return under the wing of its "great and mighty ally" in ANZUS. Over the Worldnet satellite communications system the agency beams television programs to New Zealand with the participation of leading Reagan administration figures, which are frequently accompanied by attacks on the Lange government's policies...

It is not surprising that Wellington reacted indignantly to the USIA propaganda tricks. According to the press, the incident exacerbated the protracted crisis in American-New Zealand relations. THE SYDNEY MORNING HERALD writes the New Zealand Deputy Prime Minister Palmer declared in this regard that New Zealand has no intention of changing its policy at the bidding of a foreign power.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1419

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON ENVIRONMENT DAY

PM090944 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 6 Jun 86 p 1

["Peace and the Environment. Soviet Government Statement" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] At the proposal of the leader of the UN Environment Program (UNEP), World Environmental Protection Day, which is traditionally celebrated on 5 June, will be marked this year by the symbolic ceremony of the planting of a peace tree. This contains a profound meaning -- jointly defending our earth and affirming a choice worthy of people in favor of peace and security and against war.

In holding this ceremony in Moscow we are reaffirming once again our country's unswerving and consistent desire for peace and the development of peaceful international cooperation. This was expressed with new force in the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress. Our country has put forward a specific program for creating a comprehensive international security system and the concept of a nuclear-free world aimed at ending the arms race on earth, preventing one in space, and ridding the peoples of the nuclear threat.

The Soviet Union is convinced that in the nuclear space age the security and survival of each state and international security as a whole can be ensured not by military-technical decisions or the augmentation and improvement of weapons arsenals but by their consistent reduction and the complete elimination of mass destruction weaponry. The new Soviet initiatives and proposals on ending nuclear tests, ridding mankind of nuclear and chemical weapons, and reducing conventional arms -- proposals which have evoked an extensive worldwide response -- are aimed at this. Guided by the desire to ensure in practice that nuclear explosions never again destroy man's environment, the USSR has decided to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests until 6 August 1986 in order to give the United States another chance to join in this most important initiative.

Environmental protection, concern for preserving natural riches, and the rational and farsighted use of resources that provide the conditions for mankind's prosperity are noble and at the same time difficult tasks of our time. Accomplishing them has become a nationwide affair for us. Implementing the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and strengthening our motherland's economic might, Soviet people pay daily attention to nature conservation.

The problem of protecting and improving the environment has long ceased to be a matter for individual countries, it is clearly global in nature and requires joint efforts by the peoples of all states in order to solve it. The Soviet Union, drawing serious conclusions from the Chernobyl accident, consistently advocates the broadest cooperation with all countries in solving this problem too. It is obvious that this cooperation can only be successfully implemented under conditions of lasting peace on earth. It cannot be divorced from the struggle to prevent the most terrible thing that could befall our planet — a nuclear catastrophe.

Our country will continue to participate in the activity to implement the goals of the International Year of Peace and to promote the development of cooperation on environmental protection, in which UNEP plays an important role.

May young saplings of peace take root everywhere and become mature trees whose leaves will never be burned by the flames of a thermonuclear conflagration. May they witness the world entering the 21st century without nuclear weapons.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1419

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MEXICO SUMMIT TO RENEW TEST BAN PROPOSAL

Madras THE HINDU in English 16 May 86 p 9

[Article by G. K. Reddy]

[Text] NEW DELHI, May 15.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Rajiv Gandhi, will be participating in the six-nation summit in Mexico City on August 6, the anniversary of Hiroshima bombing, to renew what has come to be known as the four-continental appeal for an immediate halt to further nuclear tests followed by a progressive reduction of the existing stockpiles.

The Heads of Government of India, Mexico, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece and Sweden had agreed to meet on the eve of the second U.S.-Soviet summit, proposed to be held later this year in Washington, to renew their appeal to the two superpowers to take urgent steps to halt the nuclear arms race.

Despite the prevailing uncertainty about this summit, between the U.S. President, Mr. Ronald Reagan and the Soviet leader, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, the signatories to the six-nation appeal have decided to meet in Mexico City on August 6 in the wake of the Chernobyl disaster, to focus world attention on the catastrophic risks involved in continuing with the nuclear arms race.

India briefed: The Soviet Ambassador to India, Mr. Vassily Rykov, called on the Secretary in the External Affairs Ministry, Mr. N. P. Jain, who is himself an expert on disarmament, to assure that Mr. Gorbachev's announcement extending the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests by another six months, till August 6, was in response to the six-nation appeal for a meaningful dialogue on the subject.

He repeated Mr. Gorbachev's declaration that he was prepared to meet Mr. Reagan in any European capital, or for that matter even in Hiroshima, to discuss a ban on further nuclear tests.

Anticipated renewal: So the timing of the next six-nation summit in Mexico City has assumed special importance because it coincides with the completion of the six-month Soviet extension of its unilateral moratorium. It will enable Mr. Gorbachev to announce a further extension of the Soviet moratorium by responding to the anticipated renewal of this four-continental appeal for an agreed or voluntary suspension of further tests.

The U.S. has placed itself both tactically and psychologically at a disadvantage by first ignoring the six-nation appeal and then sending a lengthy letter explaining how it was not possible to monitor possible violations. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, has been deriving considerable propaganda advantage by appearing to be both reasonable and responsive to the six-nation appeal by announcing a unilateral suspension.

Libyan crisis: The Libyan crisis has also soured the U.S. relations with the Third World following the strong denunciation of the American bombing as an act of aggression. The U.S. has resented the sharp criticism of its attack on Libya at the recent non-aligned ministerial conference in Delhi and during the debate in the Security Council, when not even its closest allies tried to defend its action.

After the U.S. Permanent Representative at the U.N. had spoken harshly against the Third World countries for their alleged hypocrisy in condemning the American bombing and condoning the Libyan provocation, the State Department has been privately cautioning many nonaligned countries that if they joined the chorus at Harare and repeated the Delhi performance, they would be risking American displeasure and facing the consequences in their bilateral relations with Washington.

The next six-nation summit in Mexico City on August 6 followed by the 101-nation nonaligned summit in Harare in early September, will be taking place at a time when the well-meaning appeals of the Third World are getting increasingly enmeshed in the psychological warfare between the two superpowers on issues like nuclear test ban and international terrorism.

/9274
CSO: 5250/0003

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS REPORTS FRENCH TEST--Paris, 28 May (TASS)--Despite protests of the world public, France detonated an underground nuclear device on Mururoa Atoll Tuesday. According to the AFP News Agency, this was announced in Wellington by the seismic service of New Zealand. In the words of New Zealand seismologists, this was the third nuclear explosion conducted by France in the past six weeks. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0924 GMT 28 May 86 LD] /9738

NONNUCLEAR KOREA URGED--Pyongyang, 12 Jun--An international conference to advocate a nonnuclear peaceful Korean peninsula will be convened in the DPRK capital in September. This was stated in a report published by the conference preparatory committee. [TASS report: "For a Nonnuclear Korea"] [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 13 Jun 86 p 5 PM] /9738

CSO: 5200/1419

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER LINKS U.S. CONTINUED TESTING, SALT II

PM110825 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (Second Edition) in Russian 8 Jun 86 p 3

[Captain Second Class Ye. Nikitin Military-Political Review: "Responsibility for the Future"]

[Text] Either it was sheer coincidence or, perhaps, it was the black humor of the official responsible for choosing the codenames for the nuclear explosions held in the United States that the test of a nuclear device held in Nevada on 21 May was condenamed "Panamint." Panamint is a town in California abandoned long ago. In America such towns abandoned by their inhabitants for various reasons are known as ghost towns. The semiruined houses still stand there but they are already lifeless. And although it would hardly be appropriate to seek any hidden meaning behind an arbitrary codename, in this instance the association does suggest itself.

In fact, the continuation of nuclear tests is fueling the arms race. The conditions are being created to allow the arms race to get out of control. There is an increasing likelihood of nuclear war, which would turn not only other countries but also the Unites States itself into a ghost country. Furthermore, our entire planet -- the beautiful, blue planet, as the cosmonauts say -- is threatened by the danger of becoming a lifeless specter.

Guided by a profound concern for the fate of peace, the Soviet Union continues persistently striving to eliminate the threat of nuclear catastrophe. One very important element of the Soviet program for ridding the world of nuclear weapons by the end of this century is the moratorium imposed 10 months ago on all nuclear explosions. The acceptance of it by other nuclear powers, above all the United States, would help to establish an all-embracing international security system, whose principled foundations were laid down by the 27th CPSU Congress.

However, Washington continues to disregard the Soviet initiative. Another nuclear explosion has recently been conducted at the Nevada test range -- the 12th explosion officially announced by the United States since the introduction of the Soviet nuclear test moratorium.

Understandably, it was no easy matter for the Soviet Union to impose a unilateral moratorium and to extend it several times given that the United States is continuing its nuclear test program with feverish haste. It is also understandable that the Soviet Union cannot go on indefinitely showing restraint on this issue. But the stakes are too high and the measure of responsibility too great not to try every opportunity to influence other countries' positions by force of example.

The positive point of ending nuclear explosions is comprehensible to everyone, even people far removed from politics. For that very reason the world movement in support of the Soviet moratorium is broadening and gaining strength. "The Soviet nuclear test ban represents the boldest step in the search to establish arms control in the past 25 years," D. Giddings from Shedd (Oregon) writes in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR. "To simply say that a nuclear test ban would meet the USSR's interests to a tremendous extent means closing one's eyes to the fact that this would also meet our interests and the interests of all mankind to the same tremendous extent."

The point of the matter is that reactionary circles, whose representatives are in power in the United States, are hostile to the true interests of their country and the interests of other other states and all mankind. They refuse to take into account the realities of the nuclear age and cannot abandon the illusory hopes of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and for that reason in particular do not want to accept the Soviet moratorium. This attitude is fraught with extremely grave consequences.

First, the U.S. continuation of nuclear tests can only lead to an increase in the nuclear arsenals and to the filling of those arsenals with more destructive types of weapons. Washington is using nuclear tests to implement the "program for the modernization of the strategic forces" announced by the President in October 1981. This program includes ground-based MX and Midgetman ICBM's, "Ohio" class submarines armed with Trident-1 and Trident-2 missiles, two new types of heavy bombers, cruise missiles of various basing modes, and so forth. Whereas according to U.S. figures the country's nuclear arsenal now numbers approximately 26,000 munitions of 24 different types, by the early nineties it is planned to produce a further 28,000 munitions of 19 types.

Second, nuclear tests ensure not only the quantitative buildup of nuclear weapon but also their improvement. Various guidance systems, including television radio-command guidance systems, are bieng created which ensure a high degree of accuracy. MIRVed warheads [manevriruyushchiye boyegolovki] are being developed, and this aggravates the problem of combating them. Warheads are increasing in yield and reliability and their impact on targets is becoming more effective. In other words, the qualitative changes in nuclear weapons give them new potential. That potential can be realized to the greatest extent when these weapons are used first. Hence the term first-strike weapon, or, as they still say in the West, a weapon for inflicting a "disabling" strike.

Third, the testing of nuclear charges is directly linked to the "star wars" program. This program is necessary, the White House hypocritically claims, to free mankind from nuclear weapons. It is well known, however, -- and this has been repeatedly confirmed by top officials in the U.S. Administration -- that research is being actively conducted within the SDI framework to create [sozdaniye] arms systems based on the use of nuclear energy, in other words, nuclear armaments. And this means beginning a new round in the arms race with unpredictable consequences.

Fourth, nuclear weapons tests, the related stockpiling of the latest armaments, and attempts to deply them in space lead to the destabilization of the strategic situation and undermine the fundamental accords between the USSR and the United States. The very decision by the United States to create [sozdat] a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements is a clear breach of the unlimited 1972 ABM Treaty. That is not all. Center stage in this week's news reports has been held by the U.S. decision to refuse, in the future, to observe the Soviet-U.S. legal treaty documents on strategic offensive arms limitation -- the 1972 Interim Agreement Limiting Offensive Strategic Arms (SALT I) and the 1979 treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms (SALT II).

What is the sinister essence of this reckless action by the White House? Let us recall that one of the most important provisions of SALT II provided a "ceiling" which has been observed to this day -- namely, 1,320 units for ballistic missiles with MIRVed warheads and for heavy bombers. The United States, which has adopted the course of implementing in full the all-embracing nuclear arms buildup program, that it has adopted, has stated that it will no longer adhere to those limitations. In concrete terms this means continuing to equip heavy bombers with long-range cruise missiles even when the established "ceiling" has over 100 bombers reequipped to carry cruise missiles. To remain within the SALT II framework the United States is allowed to equip up to 30 more units with cruise missiles. According to reports in NEWSWEEK one aircraft is reequipped approximately every 3 weeks. It is not hard to calculate that the United States will reach the set limit within the year. That is why the White House, pursuing the course of fueling tension and stepping up the arms race, has gone all out to nullify the whole treaty system relating to strategic armaments.

People across the ocean try to justify their actions by saying that the SALT II treaty does not allow the U.S. Air Force to implement its cruise missile deployment plans. But surely, the treaty's main purpose consists precisely in hindering and restricting the arms race process.

The United States began the process of gradually circumventing SALT II and abandoning successive limitations a long time ago. The vitally important provisions of the treaty were discarded as they became an obstacle to the implementation of the programs for the creation and stockpiling of strategic armaments. An indicative example is provided by the program for the development [razrabotka] and creation [sozdaniye] of Midgetman missiles, which is outlawed by SALT II. The treaty allows the sides to have just one new type of missile in addition to what they had when the treaty was signed. In the U.S. case that missile is the MX. Thus, the creation [sozdaniye] of the Midgetman is an indisputable violation of SALT II. Now, however, we are dealing not with individual violations but the complete abandonment of the treaty.

The unscrupulous methods used by Washington to justify its actions are also worth attention. In an attempt to pin their own blame on others, people across the ocean assert without proof that the Soviets cannot be trusted. For that reason, too, Washington's actions are morally justified, they say. But Washington's allegations do not contain a grain of truth. It concocted all these so-called "arguments" according to roughly the same recipe: A pretext is invented to cast doubt on the USSR's conscientiousness, the mass media are involved, and another anti-Soviet orgy begins.

There is no single problem today that requires such close attention or tremendous sense of responsibility as that of ending the arms race and preventing nuclear war. The Soviet Union's policy and practical actions show that it has that sense. It is time for Washington to accept its responsibility to present and future generations, abandon the attempt to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, adhere strictly to international legal accords, and join the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Washington must clearly realize that the negative stance it has adopted on the key issues of war and peace is fraught with grave consequences for mankind and really threatens to turn our planet into a lifeless specter.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1425

RELATED ISSUES

TASS CITES SIPRI REPORT CRITICIZING U.S.

LD111104 Moscow TASS in English 1035 GMT 11 Jun 86

[Text] Stockholm June 11 TASS -- That there is no progress in reduction of armaments, nuclear ones in the first place, is mainly due to the U.S.A.'s unconstructive position, experts of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, SIPRI, said in their annual report on armaments and disarmament in the world in 1986.

As for the Soviet Union, the report pointed out, it made a significant step at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments, including on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons. The USA, however, continues deploying these weapons and is not going to stop implementing its "Strategic Defense Initiative", which is stalling progress at the talks.

The development of ABM systems, however, threatens to undermine the Soviet-American ABM Treaty and wreck the SALT-I and SALT 2 treaties, the yearbook points out.

At the same time, the Pentagon is stepping up modernisation of all systems of strategic nuclear weapons, including B-1 bombers, air-based cruise missiles, Trident missile systems and MX ground-based missiles. That the problem of terminating nuclear tests has not been solved is due to the White House refusal. While the Soviet Union introduced on August 6, 1985, and then extended, the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, the USA continued in defiance to explode their nuclear devices and refused to resume talks on reaching a treaty on a complex and general ban on nuclear weapons tests.

And all this despite the fact that the majority of countries, parties to the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, are strongly advocating the achievement of progress in this field.

The Reagan administration, the report pointed out, has pushed through the decision to start the production of chemical binary munitions. The governments of West European NATO countries, Britain and West Germany in the first place, became the target of strong pressure exerted to give their consent to American plans of chemical rearmament. However, the majority of European states do not wish to offer their territory for storing new chemical weapons.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1425

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN VELIKOV'S BOOK ON NUCLEAR WINTER

LD011828 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 1 Jun 86

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Excerpts] We have all been reminded of what nuclear war could mean by this book. Let me just show it to you. It's entitled "The Climatic and Biological Consequences of Nuclear War," and was produced by the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat. The book has been published by the "Nauka" Publishing House in collaboration with the Soviet Peace Fund, and its senior editor is Academician Velikhov, whom you all know well. [video shows Bovin holding book] It is a compilation of pieces by Soviet scientists and a number of documents on the nuclear night and nuclear winter. These are concepts which entered our vocabulary not very long ago and which evidently need explaining.

The thing is that until the beginning of the 1980's, it was thought that the destructive consequences of nuclear war would arise principally from the nuclear explosions themselves--that is, the compounded effects of the shock wave, light radiation and radioactivity. But now it has been established that the long-term global consequences of nuclear war, connected with its effect on the climate and the biosphere, would be even more dreadful and catastrophic.

On the screen now you are going to see how foreign--western--specialists imagine nuclear night, and at the same time I shall read two paragraphs from the article by Yevgeniy Pavlovich Velikhov published in this book. This is what he writes:

[Video shows representation of nuclear destruction of New York and Paris, followed by nuclear winter landscapes] As a result of nuclear explosions there will be mass fires accompanied by atmospheric discharge of an enormous quantity of combustion products: soot, ash and poisonous gases with a total weight on the order of hundreds of millions of metric tons. These black clouds consisting of the finest particles of soot absorb and disperse the light of the sun, thus causing an eclipse of the planet's surface--nuclear night. As a result of this the planet's radiation equilibrium is disrupted and surface temperature falls by 15-20 degrees in a short time period. Due to the radical restructuring of the circulation system in the atmosphere this unprecedented climatic disaster will extend across the entire globe within a few weeks, causing mass destruction of the earth's flora and fauna.

Velikhov then continues: Following a nuclear war conducted according to virtually any scenario, those who survived the first blow will find themselves in conditions of extreme cold with no drinking water, food or fuel, under the influence of powerful radiation and in conditions of extreme psychological stress and raging epidemics. And all this will be happening in twilight or complete darkness. Therefore, nuclear war on any scale will mean either the disappearance of the human race or its degradation to a level lower than that in prehistoric times.

Perhaps some of you are wondering whether such books should be published, whether people should be frightened? In my view such books should be produced; people have to be told the truth. "Frighten" is not the most appropriate word here: we should all realize what could await us. At the 27th Party Congress Comrade Gorbachev said that the time has come for us to realize fully the harsh realities of our age. Nuclear weapons harbor a power capable of wiping the human race off the face of the earth. It is when we realize these harsh realities that we also realize the tremendous burden of responsibility borne by our leadership. How much patience, restraint, firmness is needed to resist the ventures of, let us say, those Americans waving their fists around.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1425

RELATED ISSUES

MONGOLIAN LEADER BACKS SOVIET, BLOC INITIATIVES

PM061330 Moscow PRAVDA (First Edition) in Russian 29 May 86 pp 4-5

[TASS report under the rubric "19th MPRP Congress": "Report by Comrade Jambyn Batmonh"]

[Excerpts] Ulaanbaatar, 28 May -- The 19th MPRP Congress opened today in the Mongolian capital. J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee, delivered a report entitled "Report by the MPRP Central Committee to the 19th Party Congress and Future Tasks."

In recent years, J. Batmonh continued, the international situation has remained highly complex and tense. These have been years that have witnessed a serious exacerbation of the political climate in the world and an increase in the threat of nuclear war. The reason for this dangerous development of events is that aggressive imperialist circles, and primarily the United States, spurning a course aimed at detente, have taken the path of breaking the military and strategic parity that has taken shape in the world, building up the nuclear arms race, and militarizating outer space.

The United States and its leading allies in Europe and Asia have set themselves the aim of taking social revenge: to roll back socialism as a social system and suppress the peoples' national liberation movement. In their attempts to establish hegemony in the world, the forces of imperialism are intensively forcing the pace of the militarization of society and the economy as the main means of carrying out a "crusade" against world socialism and against revolutionary and progressive forces.

The United States pursues an unbridled policy of strong-arm pressure, blackmail, and threats, crudely interferes in the internal affairs of peace-loving countries and peoples, and blatantly disregards their freedom, independence, and sovereignty. From the positions of neoglobalism, Washington implements a policy of state terrorism in the international arena. The imperialist policy of total antagonism and military confrontation and the unrestrained buildup of the nuclear arms race and the race in other types of mass destruction weapons create a direct threat to the very existence of mankind.

The course of world events convincingly confirms the natural law-determined nature of mankind's progressive development. Gaining more and more new heights in its development, socialism as a dynamic social system continues to have a gigantic revolutionizing influence on the course of world development.

The most urgent, topical problem of today is that of war and peace. Never before has the question of the inadmissibility of war, the survival of the human race, and the preservation of civilization been so sharply raised. The historic mission of socialism and all forces of peace and progress is to save people from thermonuclear self-annihilation.

In conditions where the world has gotten very close to such a critical point, particular topicality is acquired by the need for the realization by all and assertion everywhere of the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems. There is no reasonable alternative, must as there is no fatal inevitability of a world war.

It can be said that total justification that the past years have been years of a peace offensive by the countries of the socialist community and of their vigorous actions in defense of peace and life on earth.

Among the USSR's peace initiatives and proposals a special place is occupied by the broad complex of specific measures for the phased elimination of mass destruction weapons put forward in the 15 January 1986 statement by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev. It is realistic program for freeing mankind of the nuclear threat and ensuring equal security for all.

The pledge made by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and also its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests, observed for many months and recently extended to 6 August this year, are exceptionally important practical steps along the path to preventing nuclear war and stopping the arms race.

However, the U.S. Administration does not heed the voice of reason or the urgent demands of the world public. On the contrary, by its explosions in Nevada, piratical attack on Libya, and numerous other provocative actions, Washington is deliberately torpedoing the spirit of Geneva and blocking ways leading to an improvement in international relations.

The abiding significance of the 27th CPSU Congress lies in the fact that it determined the consistent realization of the program to eliminate mass destruction weapons and stave off the threat of nuclear war as the main direction of the foreign policy activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state for the coming years. The bases for forming an all-embracing international security system, put forward by the congress, are intended to consolidate peaceful coexistence as the highest universal principle of interstate relations.

The new initiatives recently proposed by the Soviet Union -- in particular, its proposals relating to the question of reducing conventional arms and armed forces in Europe and organizing extensive, equal cooperation between all countries in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region -- fully correspond to the interests of ensuring security over vast expanses from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

From our congress rostrum we once again express our total approval of and support for the historic decisions made by the supreme forum of Soviet Communists, the new edition of the CPSU Program, and other political documents approved at the congress, J. Batmonh stressed. Realization of the 27th decisions and the provisions of the aforementioned documents will lead to a fundamental breakthrough in the acceleration of the USSR's socioeconomic development, a further increase in socialism's might and attractiveness, the strengthening of its international positions, and the consolidation of peace and universal security.

The Warsaw Pact is an important international political and military instrument in the task of defending the achievements of socialism and universal peace. The unanimous decision of the member-states to extend the treaty confirmed their determination to increase interaction in order to prevent, in the name of the socialist cause, the breaking of military and strategic party, which is a historic achievement of the forces of peace and social progress.

In the struggle for lasting and just peace on earth the interests of our fraternal countries fully coincide with the aspirations and desires of peoples who are increasingly actively opposed to imperialism's military preparations.

A most important area of foreign policy activity by the party and the state is that of contributing to the utmost to the task of strengthening security on the Asian Continent and developing mutual understanding and cooperation between states in this region. Mongolia is in favor of freeing the continent of sources of tension and conflict.

At the same time a tense, sometimes even explosive situation persists in a number of Asian regions. There is an increasing intensification here of the military presence of the United States, which has set itself the aim of turning the extensive Asian and Pacific Ocean region into a second -- after Europe -- field of concentration of nuclear missile weapons directed against world socialism and the national liberation movement. Japan, South Korea, Pakistan, and other U.S. accomplices are being drawn increasingly actively into the orbit of this dangerous policy.

The enterprising foreign policy course of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which is aimed at resolving disputes and eliminating hotbeds of military conflicts, is a decisive factor in ensuring peace and security in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region.

Broad international support is enjoyed by the peace initiatives and active efforts of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to normalize the situation in Indochina and throughout Southeast Asia and to develop political dialogue with the ASEAN countries with the aim of establishing an atmosphere of trust and good-neighborliness and turning the region into a zone of peace, stability,and cooperation.

The task of strengthening all-Asian security is assisted by the constructive proposals put forward by the Workers Party of Korea and the DPRK Government aimed at the peaceful democratic unification of the motherland.

We attach great significance to traditionally friendly relations with the Republic of India. Its realistic, peace-loving course serves as an important factor in strengthening peace and security in Asia and throughout the world.

The present complex situation on our continent urgently demands that all Asian states -- large and small -- become actively involved in the joint search for ways to ensure security and work together in the interests of reaching a political settlement to crisis situations and topical problems.

The idea put forward by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev of a comprehensive approach to the problem of ensuring security in Asia presupposes precisely such unity of efforts by the Asian states and a joint search for ways to strengthen peace in the region. It serves as the basis for solving the continent's complex problems in the interests of the peoples who populate it.

The proposal put forward by Mongolia on creating a mechanism that would rule out the use of force in relations between states in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region is consonant with this approach.

We will continue to make active efforts to implement this proposal in close conjunction with the constructive initiatives of other states in the region.

The way to lasting, secure peace in Asia lies in strengthening mutual understanding, good-neighborliness, and cooperation, developing broad political dialogue, and peacefully resolving disputes. The attempts made by imperialism to knock together military and political blocs or a so-called "Pacific Ocean association" in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region are at variance with the peoples' fundamental interests and the safeguarding of their peaceful future.

Eliminating the nuclear threat is a task for the whole of mankind. A big role in averting the danger of a nuclear catastrophe is played by political parties, parliaments and various mass organizations in the Asian countries. It is these aims that are served by the results of the international meetings held in our country between representatives of parliaments, and trade union, youth, and women's organizations from Asian countries. We are in favor of holding an all-Asian forum for peace and cooperation with the participation of representatives of the broad public from Asian countries.

Mongolia highly values the role and activity of the United Nations and attaches great significance to increasing the effectiveness and influence of this international organization in the task of ensuring peace and security. Over the period with which the report is concerned Mongolia's activity within the United Nations and its organs has increased significantly. A number of important resolutions on the problems of peace and disarmament, including the declaration on Peoples' Right to Peace, have been adopted on Mongolia's initiative.

/9716
CSO: 5200/1425

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

MOSCOW PEACE CONFERENCE--Tokyo, 23 May KYODO--The Japan Confederation of A and H Bomb Sufferers (Hidankyo), a Tokyo-based union of atomic bomb sufferers in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, will send its two delegates to a peace conference to be held in Moscow 27-29 May, the organization said Friday. Takeshi Ito, one of the chairmen of the group, and Yoshio Saito, a director, are to attend "the Second All-Union Conference on the Problems of Peace and Prevention of Nuclear War," sponsored by the Science Academy of the Soviet Union. The two will attend the plenary meeting and a special session on the after effects of a nuclear war. Speaking of his expectations for the meet, Saito said, "We want to forcefully convey the misery of Hibakusha (the sufferers) and the urgent necessity for the abolition of nuclear arms at this time when the world is worried about the perils of radioactivity after the Chernobyl accident." [Text] [Tokyo KYODO in English 1035 GMT 23 May 86 OW] /12913

TASS ON PARIS DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE--Paris, June 8 TASS--The fifth annual conference of the Movement for European Nuclear Disarmament came to a close in the French suburb of Evry today. It was attended by more than 650 representatives of anti-war organizations of West European countries, the United States and Canada, and by a group of Soviet experts on the problems of disarmament and international security. The major importance of the programme, put forward by the Soviet Union, for the elimination of nuclear weapons was emphasized at the conference. The programme had been set out in the January 15 statement of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The conference gave a high appraisal of the USSR's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1644 GMT 8 Jun 86 LD]

/9716
CSO: 5200/1425

END